

|                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                          |                                             |                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ERIC Document Resume                                                                                                                                                                                         |                          | See Instruction Sheet                       |                                       | DATE OF RESUME 6/23/65                                                                                                                                                         | DATE RECEIVED                                                            |
| <b>A. PUBLICATION DATA</b>                                                                                                                                                                                   |                          |                                             |                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
| 1. ERIC NUMBER<br><b>ED000120</b>                                                                                                                                                                            |                          | 2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).<br><b>7458</b> |                                       | 3. IDENTIFICATION NO.<br><b>N.A.</b>                                                                                                                                           |                                                                          |
| 4. AUTHOR(S):<br><b>N.A.</b>                                                                                                                                                                                 |                          |                                             |                                       | DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                          |
| 5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:<br><b>Final Report to Rosenberg Foundation of College of the Pacific Pilot Study in Teacher Education, An Accelerated Program for Elementary School Teachers, 1954-1958</b> |                          |                                             |                                       | MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE<br>YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>                                                                                |                                                                          |
| 6. PUBLICATION TITLE:<br><b>N.A.</b>                                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                                             |                                       | COPYRIGHT GRANTED<br>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                                                                                       |                                                                          |
| 7. EDITOR(S):<br><b>N.A.</b>                                                                                                                                                                                 |                          |                                             |                                       | COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED<br>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>                                                                                            |                                                                          |
| 8. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE<br><b>University of the Pacific</b>                                                                                                                                                   |                          |                                             |                                       | TYPE OF REPORT<br>PROPOSAL <input type="checkbox"/><br>IN-PROGRESS <input type="checkbox"/><br>FINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/><br>FOLLOW-UP <input type="checkbox"/> |                                                                          |
| 9. PLACE OF ORIGIN<br>ORG. <b>University of the Pacific</b><br>ST. <b>Stockton, Cal.</b><br>CITY <b>Stockton, Cal.</b>                                                                                       |                          |                                             |                                       | OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                          |
| 10. VOL.<br><b>N.A.</b>                                                                                                                                                                                      | 11. PAGES<br><b>N.A.</b> | 12. MO./YR.<br><b>60</b>                    | 13. TOTAL PP.<br><b>103</b>           | TELE. EXT.<br>INST/LCC CODE                                                                                                                                                    | ERIC SATELLITE CODE                                                      |
| <b>B. INDEXING DATA</b>                                                                                                                                                                                      |                          |                                             |                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
| 14. SUBJECT AREA                                                                                                                                                                                             |                          |                                             | 15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR<br><b>report</b> |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
| 16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)                                                                                                                                                                                    |                          |                                             |                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
| <b>final report</b>                                                                                                                                                                                          |                          | <b>programs</b>                             |                                       | <b>elementary edu.</b>                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                          |
| <b>professional edu.</b>                                                                                                                                                                                     |                          | <b>acceleration</b>                         |                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
| <b>teacher edu.</b>                                                                                                                                                                                          |                          | <b>summer programs</b>                      |                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
| 17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)                                                                                                                                                                                |                          |                                             |                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
| <p>Report of a pilot project to accelerate the usual 4-year elementary teacher preparation program into 3 years and two summer sessions, thus enabling candidates to begin teaching a year earlier.</p>      |                          |                                             |                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
| <b>ERIC No.</b>                                                                                                                                                                                              |                          |                                             |                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
| 18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT                                                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                                             |                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
| <b>C. FUNDING DATA</b>                                                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                                             |                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
| 19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION                                                                                                                                                                                  |                          |                                             | 20. DIVISION OR DEPT.                 |                                                                                                                                                                                | 21. CONTRACT NO.<br><br>PROJECT NO.                                      |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                          |                                             | 22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT             |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                          |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                          |                                             | 23. DURATION OF PROJECT               |                                                                                                                                                                                | U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare<br>Office of Education |

5-18  
R

HE 7458

7458

FINAL REPORT TO ROSENBERG FOUNDATION

ED000120

of

COLLEGE OF THE PACIFIC

*Pilot Study in Teacher Education*

an accelerated program

for

Elementary School Teachers

1954-1958

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE  
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.



Stockton, California

ED000020

7/1/60

Final Report to Rosenberg Foundation  
of  
College of the Pacific  
Pilot Study in Teacher Education  
An Accelerated Program  
for  
Elementary School Teachers  
1954 - 1958

Submitted, January, 1960  
College of the Pacific  
Stockton, California

## FOREWORD

This report is submitted to the Rosenberg Foundation as a summary and evaluation of a pilot study in teacher education whereby an attempt was made to tap a new source of teacher supply through two cooperating public junior colleges. Students were selected who had an interest in becoming elementary school teachers, who possessed the academic and personal qualifications, but who would likely not have continued college work for financial reasons, because of the time factor, or a combination of these with others. The selected students were given an accelerated program of two ten-week summer sessions and one academic year, thus going into the classroom as teachers one year after leaving junior college. ||

The idea of this project was born through the deliberations of the Committee on the Role of the Junior College, a study committee of the California Council on Teacher Education, of which the writer was chairman. Jointly between the efforts of that committee, this Rosenberg-sponsored project, and a general growing concern, the junior colleges of the State of California are now aggressively involving themselves in assisting prospective lower division students in the pre-professional aspects of becoming teachers.

The program developed through this project continues as one of the teacher-education patterns at the College of the Pacific for students who would otherwise find it impossible to prepare for teaching.

J. Marc Jantzen  
January 18, 1960



Staff Members Participating  
in This Pilot Study

---

Fay Goleman, Psychiatric Social Worker

George S. Ingebo, Guidance and Evaluation

J. Marc Jantzen, Chairman of Executive Committee

Lloyd H. King, Supervisor of Pilot Study Group II

Roy E. Learned, Supervisor of Pilot Study Group I

Elda M. Newton, Supervisor of Pilot Study Group III

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER                                                                                         | PAGE |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| FOREWORD                                                                                        |      |
| I. INTRODUCTION, GENERAL CONCLUSIONS, AND RESULTS . . . . .                                     | 1    |
| II. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY . . . . .                                                          | 4    |
| Background . . . . .                                                                            | 4    |
| The Liberal Arts Pattern . . . . .                                                              | 5    |
| A Proposed Pilot Study . . . . .                                                                | 5    |
| Applicants for the Pilot Study . . . . .                                                        | 8    |
| An Advisory Committee . . . . .                                                                 | 9    |
| Scholarship Funds . . . . .                                                                     | 9    |
| III. SELECTION OF CANDIDATES . . . . .                                                          | 10   |
| IV. THE PROGRAM . . . . .                                                                       | 31   |
| 1. Experience with the Classes in Elementary Education . . . . .                                | 32   |
| 2. Student Teaching Experience . . . . .                                                        | 36   |
| 3. The Internship . . . . .                                                                     | 38   |
| 4. The Concurrent Seminars . . . . .                                                            | 45   |
| 5. The Key Role of the School Principal . . . . .                                               | 50   |
| 6. College Advisor-Supervisor Role . . . . .                                                    | 54   |
| 7. Recommendations to the College . . . . .                                                     | 56   |
| V. HOW DO PILOT STUDY STUDENTS COMPARE WITH OTHER COLLEGE<br>OF THE PACIFIC STUDENTS? . . . . . | 58   |
| 1. Type of Study . . . . .                                                                      | 58   |
| 2. Test Information About the Groups . . . . .                                                  | 59   |
| VI. STUDENT, ADVISOR, AND FACULTY EVALUATION . . . . .                                          | 66   |

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK— NOT FILMED

iii

| CHAPTER                                                                                | PAGE |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| VII. FINAL CONCLUSIONS . . . . .                                                       | 73   |
| APPENDICES                                                                             |      |
| A. Some Observations on Selection Criteria as Related to<br>Job Performances . . . . . | 76   |
| B. Comments on Sources of Information Leading to Selection .                           | 81   |
| C. Suggested Participating Activities . . . . .                                        | 87   |
| D. Sample of Informal Questionnaire . . . . .                                          | 88   |
| E. Sample of Class Bulletin . . . . .                                                  | 89   |
| F. Sample of Second Year Program Report . . . . .                                      | 90   |
| G. Sample of Pilot Teacher Evaluation Sheet . . . . .                                  | 94   |
| H. Distributions of Derived Scores of Pilot Study Students .                           | 95   |
| General Culture Test . . . . .                                                         | 95   |
| American Council for Education Psychological Examination .                             | 98   |
| School and College Ability Test . . . . .                                              | 100  |
| Graduate Record Examination . . . . .                                                  | 101  |

## LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE                                                                                                                                                              | PAGE |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I. Age of the 47 Pilot Study Participants at the Time of their Acceptance into the Study . . . . .                                                                 | 18   |
| II. Marital Status of the 47 Pilot Study Participants at the Time of their Acceptance into the Study . . .                                                         | 19   |
| III. Financial Status and Source of Income of the 47 Pilot Study Participants at the Time of their Acceptance into the Study . . . . .                             | 20   |
| IV. Number of Children in Family of Origin of the 47 Pilot Study Participants at the Time of their Acceptance into the Study . . . . .                             | 21   |
| V. Educational Level of Both Parents of the 47 Pilot Study Participants at the Time of their Acceptance into the Study . . . . .                                   | 22   |
| VI. Unclassified Listing and Tabulation of the Occupations of Both Parents of the 47 Pilot Study Participants at the Time of their Acceptance into the Study . . . | 23   |
| VII. Years of Residence in California of the 47 Pilot Study Participants at the Time of their Acceptance into the Study . . . . .                                  | 24   |
| VIII. Totals and Means of Derived Scores of Pilot Study Students on the General Culture Test taken at the end of the Sophomore Year . . . . .                      | 62   |
| IX. Means and Totals of Derived Scores of Pilot Study Students on Scholastic Aptitude Tests . . . . .                                                              | 63   |
| X. Comparisons of Pilot Study Groups with Education Majors and College of the Pacific Seniors on Graduate Record Examination Tests . . . . .                       | 64   |
| XI. Totals and Means of Derived Scores of Pilot Study Students on the Graduate Record Examination Tests Taken Prior to Graduation . . . . .                        | 65   |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

A dual concern about the crisis proportions of the need for elementary school teachers in California in the early 1950's and for the necessity to provide that teachers entering classrooms be adequately trained for their professional responsibilities led the School of Education of the College of the Pacific to devise a three-year Pilot Study in accelerated elementary teacher education. The objectives of this study were primarily as follows:

- 1) to tap a new source of teacher supply, and
- 2) to prepare selected students to become fully credentialled teachers a chronological year sooner than would have been possible without the combination of acceleration and scholarships.

This report will describe the program which began in the Spring of 1954 under Rosenberg Foundation support. It will also show how the Study itself made a permanent change in many of the procedures of the School of Education which in turn had a significant impact on the professional educational philosophy and practice of several school districts in the Central Valley.

### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RESULTS

- 1) The College staff involved in this Study, and the staff members most closely associated with the Study in the two cooperating junior colleges (Modesto Junior College and Stockton College), are convinced that the junior colleges of the State represent a more fertile field for intensive recruitment than they have been



hitherto considered by four-year institutions.

2) Untapped sources of teacher supply exist among students of minority groups, among women whose education was interrupted by motherhood and household duties, among veterans or young men whose education has been interrupted by military service and for whom time is a large factor in determining a choice of career, and among young students whose family financial obligations cut short their college training at the end of two years.

3) Acceleration, properly planned, provides the same professional preparation and liberal arts course work as that required of the regular four-year elementary teaching credential students of the College.

4) Permanent curriculum changes have come about through an increased concern with teacher education on the part of other staff members. Four major committees in the School of Education were formed during the Study to reorganize the standard sequences of courses for students in both elementary and secondary teacher education.

5) Acceleration, including the internship feature, has been adopted as a permanent "track" available to selected students in completing their credential and course work. The pattern which the Pilot Study in Elementary Education experimented with during the three years of the study has also been adapted for students preparing for secondary teaching.

6) A significant concomitant of the Pilot Study was the opportunity it provided for joint planning and directing of the project by the Staff of the College and administrators and classroom

teachers from the school districts of Modesto, Stockton, San Joaquin County and Stanislaus County. The pattern used has continued to be followed for other College-community interests in improving the quality of teacher education and professional competence.

7) The Pilot Study brought into sharp focus the need for further exploration of the relationship and responsibilities of the school principal in reducing the loss to the profession of first-year drop-outs of qualified young teachers.

## CHAPTER II

### DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

#### Background Leading to the Pilot Study

The acute shortage of teachers in the public schools following World War II led to the question: Are there sources of potential teachers available that are largely untapped?

In December of 1952 the California Council on Teacher Education appointed a committee on the Relation of the Junior College to Teacher Education with J. Marc Jantzen, Dean of the School of Education at the College of the Pacific, as chairman. Investigations by this committee revealed that a sizable number of California junior colleges, in an attempt to meet certain local teacher shortage needs, were not only offering an introductory course in teaching with observations, but becoming involved in methods courses and actual practice teaching.

The policy established by legislative enactment in 1930 to make a bachelor's degree with certain professional courses the minimum requirements for a general elementary credential seemed to be challenged by these newly developing practices in these junior colleges. The prospect of coping with the teacher shortage crisis in the early 1950's presented the following alternatives:

1. Attempt to maintain current standards of a bachelor's degree with designated professional courses. This would mean that the number of persons on sub-standard teaching credentials would increase at an accelerated rate.
2. Reduce the standards to a two-year program of a normal training nature. This would place major emphasis on professional preparation especially dealing with techniques at the sacrifice of the liberal arts courses.

3. Tap actual new sources of teacher supply and try to maintain present standards of a liberal arts education with the acceleration in time spent in teacher preparation.

#### The Liberal Arts Pattern

The School of Education staff members at the College of the Pacific were convinced that an elementary school teacher should receive his teacher education in a liberal arts environment such as is found in the four-year institutions in California accredited by the California State Board of Education to prepare elementary school teachers. These programs require approximately 25 per cent of the college courses in professional teacher education work and 75 per cent in the liberal arts.

It should also be noted that nearly forty per cent of all California collegiate enrollment is found in the public junior colleges of this state. These junior colleges annually graduate capable young people who might be interested in becoming elementary school teachers but who lack the financial resources either to pay the usual tuition at private colleges within their community or to leave home and pay for room and board in tax-supported colleges.

For those students planning on becoming elementary school teachers these junior colleges can offer an adequate two-year collegiate program of liberal education.

#### A Proposed Pilot Study

Since the California junior colleges offered a potential supply of teachers inadequately tapped, the School of Education at the College of the Pacific applied for and was granted funds by the Rosenberg Foundation of San Francisco for a pilot study to try to



secure students who had completed a two-year course in either Modesto Junior College or Stockton (junior) College; who had the necessary scholarship and potential to do upper division college work; who would be interested in becoming teachers; but who financially were unable to attend college two more years, or found the time factor too great a hindrance.

To solve the financial problems, the Rosenberg Foundation supplied the funds for operational and administrative costs, while the college furnished full tuition scholarships for the participants. The time factor was adjusted by telescoping the usual two-year program into two ten-week summer sessions and one school year. This permitted the participants in the study to accelerate the usual four-year preparation program into three years and two summer sessions, thus enabling the candidate to begin teaching a year sooner.

Although the basic curriculum supposedly was the same for the pilot group as for the regular students, through a re-arrangement of the courses, and through adjustments of content and instruction of these courses, certain curricular changes were inevitably made.

Most of the students accepted for the Pilot Study had completed 64 transferable college credits in the junior college. Their acceleration program was as follows:

|                                                  |                 |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| A ten-week summer session                        | 12 units        |
| Fall semester                                    | 16 units        |
| Spring semester (including Directed Teaching)    | 14 units        |
| A ten-week summer session                        | 12 units        |
| First year on the job, Independent Investigation | 6 units         |
| Completed degree and credential                  | <u>60 units</u> |



As indicated in the acceleration program above, the two years in junior college plus an academic year and two ten-week summer sessions were six units short of a liberal arts degree and a full teaching credential. It had purposely been planned to withhold two required courses for an elementary teaching credential: Child Growth and Development, and Principles of Elementary Education, to insure the student's completing the full requirements for his credential, and to test the nature of the combined theory-practice experience. These two requirements were met during the first year of teaching through an Independent Investigations course under the supervision of a college staff member, with the Child Growth and Development offered in the fall and the Principles of Elementary Education in the spring. The college instructor drew upon the student's actual classroom experiences and needs, together with appropriate reading. The entire group met in a seminar session on alternate weeks throughout the first year of teaching.

Through special arrangements with the California State Department of Education, each of the Pilot Study participants was granted a provisional teaching credential for his first year of teaching. The same college instructor who directed the course work in Child Growth and Development and Principles of Elementary Education also supervised each teacher during his internship year. For the college instructor, this assignment was considered a full-time load. Although this year of internship was originally not the main feature of the study, it developed into one of the most important concomitant findings for the improvement of the regular teacher education program.

Applicants for the Pilot Study

Applicants for the Pilot Study in Elementary Teacher Education were considered from Modesto Junior College and Stockton (junior) College. A guidance specialist and a psychiatric social worker from the College of the Pacific staff cooperated with the guidance staff in each of the junior colleges in order to select candidates. Those college instructors involved in the teacher education preparation of these students were also consulted before final approval was given to any applicant.

Every effort possible was made to select only those individuals who would be unable to do the usual additional two-year program in some teacher education institution either because of the lack of funds, or because of the time factor, or both.

The study included three separate groups, each of which was involved in the program for two calendar years; one academic year and two ten-week summer sessions in the pre-service preparation, and one academic year in the internship (first year of teaching). The number of candidates for each group originally selected and completing the two year program is as follows:

|           |           | <u>Selected</u> | <u>Completing<br/>Program</u> |
|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Group I   | (1954-56) | 17              | 14                            |
| Group II  | (1955-57) | 19              | 17                            |
| Group III | (1956-58) | 18              | 16*                           |
|           | Totals    | <u>54</u>       | <u>47</u>                     |

---

\* One student included in the tally as completing the program completed his final course work at a later date because of an unusual situation developing around military service. For purposes of the study he participated fully in the special features of the program.

#### An Advisory Committee

An Advisory Committee was established which consisted of the following: the dean of the School of Education of the College as chairman; the president of the College; the academic vice-president of the College; five additional staff members from the College's School of Education; one representative from each of the following - Modesto Junior College, Modesto City Schools (central office), Stanislaus County Schools, Stockton (junior) College, Stockton Unified School District (central office), San Joaquin County Schools; consultant in teacher education of the State Department of Education; and the executive secretary of the Commission on Teacher Education of the California Teachers Association. This group met five times during the four years of the study, receiving reports from those actively involved in the project and offering valuable suggestions.

#### Scholarship Funds

In addition to the funds supplied by the grant from the Rosenberg Foundation for the operational and administrative costs of the Pilot Study, the College provided tuition scholarships for each participant to the extent of approximately \$1000 each raised largely through special appeals to alumni and friends of the College. Since several who dropped out of the program had used most of these tuition funds, the College invested slightly more than \$50,000 in scholarships in this project, in addition to retaining several Pilot Study Staff as permanent faculty members.

### CHAPTER III

#### SELECTION OF CANDIDATES

During the three years of the Pilot Study 190 students were interviewed and 54 finally selected to participate in the Study: 17 for Group I (1954-1956); 19 for Group II (1955-57); and 18 for Group III (1956-58). Forty-seven students completed the program. Of the students who did not complete the first fifteen months as scheduled, two were required by unforeseen and quite serious family obligations to take full-time jobs; one did not succeed in student teaching; one dropped out due to pregnancy; one left to get married; and one was called into the Armed Forces. Of those whose program was interrupted, four are at this writing in the profession, either teaching or completing preparation to teach.

It is important to point out that candidates were selected to match the general range of ability of the student body of the College of the Pacific, so as not to weight the outcome by selecting the "cream of the crop" for either high academic ranking, outstanding leadership ability, or both. A trained psychologist was used in the initial interviewing, testing, and evaluating of transcripts.

The use of a social worker was added, however, as a unique feature of the selection of candidates because financial need was to be one of the strong determining factors in selection in the program. Since financial need often involves intricate family relationships and obligations, it was believed that some special knowledge of these factors and some skill in interviewing in relation to them would expedite the screening process.



Interviews were independently carried on with a division of emphasis centering around financial need and family circumstances for the social worker, and vocational suitability and academic history for the psychologist. Final selection was made by bringing together all available data and arriving at a joint judgment.

Requirements. Candidates for the Pilot Study were required

- 1) to be graduates of Stockton College or Modesto Junior College;
- 2) to have successfully completed two years of junior college work within the immediately preceding academic year;
- 3) to be unable to continue with college work without financial assistance;
- 4) to be preparing for elementary teaching;
- 5) to be ready to pursue an accelerated program;
- 6) to find the accelerated time factor a decisive one in undertaking further teacher education;
- 7) to show reasonably strong motivation for teaching;
- 8) to evidence suitability for elementary teaching.

Once accepted into the program, Pilot Study students were expected to meet the same criteria as applied to all education majors in the School of Education receiving a credential:

1. Upper division grade point average of .25 grade points above "C" before student teaching
2. Acceptance by the School of Education Credentials Committee before student teaching



3. Graduation from college of the Pacific, fulfilling all college liberal arts course requirements.
4. Major in Elementary Education
  - a. Proficiency in Elementary School Subjects
  - b. Natural science, music, and art requirements
5. Passing performance in speech test
6. Physical examination and X-ray.

Additional criteria required by the Pilot Study Program were as follows:

1. Admission to College of the Pacific with at least 56 transferable units
2. Close working relationship with one faculty member through professional courses and internship
3. Continuous school attendance through two summers and the intervening school year
4. Employment (in the internship year) with a provisional credential, with approximately six units remaining to qualify for a bachelor's degree and a full credential
5. Employment (in the internship year) by a school district close enough to College of the Pacific for college supervision.

The circumstances surrounding the selection of each group changed, and for purposes of identification the staff continued to think in terms of Group I, Group II, and Group III. Furthermore, inasmuch as a different supervisor followed each group from the

beginning of the program straight through to the end, it became a functional convenience to continue identifying the groups as distinct entities throughout the life of the Study.

Initial Screening. Permission to start the program with the summer session of 1954 came in late May, 1954, so that selections for the first group were made under such serious time limitations that interviews and junior college records had to be depended upon for most of the information used as a basis for selection of candidates. Counselors and teachers were very helpful in interpreting and supplementing records in the applicants' folders. In all but one case, applicants had taken at least part of a battery of tests in their junior colleges.

The following is a list of the tests for which scores were found in the Junior College folders of the students accepted for Group I:

|                                              |    |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| Psychological Examination - - - - -          | 12 |
| Cooperative English Test- - - - -            | 8  |
| Kuder Preference Record - - - - -            | 6  |
| Occupational Interest Inventory - - - - -    | 6  |
| California Test of Mental Maturity - - - - - | 4  |
| California Test of Personality - - - - -     | 4  |
| Stanford Advanced Achievement                |    |
| Test of Mathematics - - - - -                | 4  |
| Adjustment Inventory - - - - -               | 3  |
| Study of Values - - - - -                    | 3  |
| Traxler Reading Tests - - - - -              | 3  |
| Tyler-Kimber Study Skills - - - - -          | 3  |
| Mooney Problem Check List - - - - -          | 2  |
| Nelson Denny Reading Test - - - - -          | 2  |
| Carter Mathematics Test - - - - -            | 1  |
| National Achievement Tests - - - - -         | 1  |
| Study Habits Inventory - - - - -             | 1  |

Standardized Tests and Related Information-Gaining Materials.

Only a few of the wide variety of published instruments were used for selecting students to be included in the Pilot Study. As stated previously, the task was made more difficult by a deliberate attempt to select a wide range of potentialities for each group. Also, failure in a program such as this was viewed as a serious personal event that should be avoided for the sake of the student. These somewhat conflicting aims required that the testing program also be flexible and in some cases rather extensive. Since a large number of applicants not included in the study could not be followed up the statements below do not constitute a study of the validity of the instrument used. Difference in professional preparation due to differences in supervisors and curricula for the three pilot groups make it impossible to study the comparative predictability of the instruments used. The following are generalizations that seem rather stable concerning the usefulness of each device for gaining information.

1. The American Council on Education Psychological Examination
  - a. Close timing probably brings in the idea of efficiency in trial and error thinking.
  - b. Introductory examples and their explanations preceding each section probably brought in factors of inclination and ability to learn and then to apply a process.
  - c. High scores seem to be a good indication of scholastic ability. Scores in the upper quartile or derived scores of fifty-seven and above can usually be accepted without confirmation through the use of other tests of this nature.

- d. Scores were available for almost all students as a part of their orientation program in the first semester of college.
2. Other group test scores useful in the general area of scholastic aptitude frequently found in the college, high school, or elementary records were:
  - a. California Test of Mental Maturity
  - b. Army General Classification Test
  - c. Otis Quick Scoring Test
3. Individual tests of intelligence
  - a. Wechsler-Bellevue Intelligence Scale, Forms 1 and 2, or Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, administered either in the junior college testing section or the College of the Pacific testing section, were used. These tests were used where there were either low group-test scores or where the scores of group tests conflicted severely.
  - b. The Leiter International Performance Scale was used when the opportunity for the examiner to observe the way a student differentiated a problem and then developed and used a principle in solving it seemed particularly important.
4. The Cooperative-General Culture Test was administered to all applicants still being considered late in the spring of each selecting year.
  - a. Administration of this test was implemented by asking applicants of the pilot study to take the test along with the College of the Pacific sophomores at the time it was



given at the College. Group administrations were carried out at Modesto Junior College for those students finding it difficult to come to Stockton to take the test.

- b. The tests were scored on the basis of College of the Pacific norms. These derived scores were used as indications of the subject matter background with which the student would enter the program.
  - c. Since norms were derived for all five parts of the test or the same standardizing population, differential comparisons were used in checking against achievement in classes shown on college transcripts.
5. The adjustment inventory was used after the first year as an aid to interviewing.
- a. Published norms were used to give indications of unusual performance in the four areas.
  - b. Form of the inventory made it easy to analyze and discuss various statements with the applicant.
  - c. Inclusion of a section dealing with health adjustment was considered important.
6. The Mooney-Problem Check List was used in some cases as a supplementary indicator of problem areas.
7. Projective Methods were used in a relatively small number of case if the information in the area of personality was considered inconclusive from other indicators and interviews.
- a. The Thematic-Apperception Test was considered most useful because of its emphasis in the area of social relationships.

- b. In some cases the Thematic-Apperception Test was used to look also for indications of direction and intensity of motivation as it might be applicable to teaching as a vocational choice.
  - c. The Rorschach Psych-Diagnostic was used infrequently.
  - d. More cases requiring use of projective techniques were rejected than were accepted in the Pilot Study.
8. Other tests were used also.
- a. The Kuder Preference Record had been administered to more than half the students and was available in folders
  - b. The Tyler-Kimber Study Skills
  - c. Reading tests, most often the Traxler Silent Reading Test
  - d. The Cooperative English Test
  - e. The Occupational Interest Inventory

Selection of Group II started in the Fall of 1954 and continued on through Spring 1955, thus allowing for about seven months of preliminary interviewing, testing, and gathering of pertinent information as compared with less than one month for Pilot Group I. Tests were given to supplement the batteries used by the junior colleges. In some cases individual tests were given at the junior colleges, and more were administered in the College of the Pacific testing section. Also, the counselors at the junior colleges were better informed about the program and could spot likely candidates earlier in the academic year than had been possible for Group I. The same procedure continued for the selection of Group III.

Age, Marital Status, Veterans. Of the 47 who completed the Pilot Study program, there were 32 women and 15 men, ranging in age from nineteen years to forty-five (Table I). Of the thirteen married students, six were men, and seven were women. (Table II). Of the six married men, five had children (three with three each, and two with one child each). Of the seven married women, four had children (two with two each, one with three children, and one with one child). Five of the men were veterans. For the older students, the acceleration features in conjunction with the financial assistance was especially important.

TABLE I  
AGE OF THE 47 PILOT STUDY PARTICIPANTS AT THE TIME  
OF THEIR ACCEPTANCE INTO THE STUDY

| Age     | Men | Women | Total |
|---------|-----|-------|-------|
| 19 - 20 | 3   | 25    | 28    |
| 21 - 22 | 3   | 1     | 4     |
| 23 - 24 | 3   | 1     | 4     |
| 25 - 26 | 2   | 1     | 3     |
| 27      | 0   | 1     | 1     |
| 30 - 31 | 3   | 0     | 3     |
| 34 - 35 | 0   | 2     | 2     |
| 40      | 1   | 0     | 1     |
| 45      | 0   | 1     | 1     |
| Total   | 15  | 32    | 47    |

TABLE II  
MARITAL STATUS OF THE 47 PILOT STUDY PARTICIPANTS AT THE TIME  
OF THEIR ACCEPTANCE INTO THE STUDY

|         | Men | Women | Total |
|---------|-----|-------|-------|
| Married | *6  | **7   | 13    |
| Single  | 9   | 25    | 34    |
| Total   | 15  | 32    | 47    |

\*Of the 6 married men, 5 had children (3 had 3 each  
2 had 1 each)

\*\*Of the 7 married women, 4 had children (2 had 2 each  
1 had 3  
1 had 1)

Financial Need. The Heller Budget\* was used as a rough guide to determine financial need. However, dollars and cents as a rigid measure was modified to take into account the number of siblings and other dependents in the family, any serious and costly illnesses the family might be in debt for or which affected the earning capacity of a parent or spouse, and the age of elderly parents for whom the student had assumed responsibility, to mention only a few of the contingent factors considered when determining financial need. The tabulation on financial status (Table III) differentiates between those students who were still living with their own parents and those who were either self-supporting or had already established their own families. Twenty-eight students were supported by their families, and nineteen students were self-supporting.

---

\* The Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics of the University of California, Quantity and Cost Budgets for Two Income Levels, September 1955.



In more than half of the families where students still lived with their families, the total family income was under \$300 a month. Among the self-supporting students, three-quarters of them had an income of less than \$300 a month (including G.I. benefits.)

TABLE III

FINANCIAL STATUS AND SOURCE OF INCOME OF THE 47 PILOT STUDY PARTICIPANTS AT THE TIME OF THEIR ACCEPTANCE INTO THE STUDY

| Monthly Income* | Support from family | Self-supporting student | Total |
|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| \$0 - 99        | 2                   | 3                       | 5     |
| 100 - 199       | 4                   | 6                       | 10    |
| 200 - 299       | 9                   | 6                       | 15    |
| 300 - 399       | 7                   | 2                       | 9     |
| 400 - 499       | 5                   | 1                       | 6     |
| 500 or over     | 1                   | 1                       | 2     |
| Total           | 28                  | 19                      | 47    |

\* For unmarried students supported by parents, income refers to total family income.

For whatever sociological significance it may have, family size was tabulated (Table IV). Almost half of the group came from families in which they were one of four or more siblings, including one from a family of nine, and one from a family of thirteen.

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY OF ORIGIN OF THE 47 PILOT STUDY PARTICIPANTS AT THE TIME OF THEIR ACCEPTANCE INTO THE STUDY

| Family Size | (including student himself) | Men | Women | Total |
|-------------|-----------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
| Only child  |                             | 1   | 4     | 5     |
| 2 children  |                             | 4   | 9     | 13    |
| 3 children  |                             | 2   | 5     | 7     |
| 4 children  |                             | 1   | 7     | 8     |
| 5 children  |                             | 1   | 3     | 4     |
| 6 children  |                             | 3   | 3     | 6     |
| 7 children  |                             | 2   | 0     | 2     |
| 9 children  |                             | 1   | 0     | 1     |
| 13 children |                             | 0   | 1     | 1     |
| Total       |                             | 15  | 32    | 47    |

Education and Occupation of Parents. In tapping new sources of teacher supply, the factor of reaching into groups which have not yet moved rapidly up the social scale might be partially reflected in a look at the educational background (Table V) of the parents of the students and of their occupational status (Table VI). As the tabulations show, the range is great, but there is also some significance in how teaching represents a sharp upgrading of occupational status when compared with the number of parents who had not completed either grammar school or high school. Two parents had no schooling at all. Eleven parents had not completed grammar school, and 19 had not completed high school. Twenty-seven parents had completed grammar

school, and twelve completed high school. Seven parents had had some college education, four had completed college, and three had done graduate work. Six parents had gone to schools for special vocational training.

TABLE V  
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF BOTH PARENTS OF THE 47 PILOT STUDY  
PARTICIPANTS AT THE TIME OF THEIR ACCEPTANCE INTO THE STUDY

| Education of both parents | Men | Women | Total |
|---------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
| Grammar School:           |     |       |       |
| Incompleted               | 4   | 7     | 11    |
| Completed                 | 11  | 16    | 27    |
| High School:              |     |       |       |
| Incompleted               | 2   | 17    | 19    |
| Completed                 | 6   | 6     | 12    |
| College:                  |     |       |       |
| Incompleted               | 2   | 5     | 7     |
| Completed                 | 1   | 3     | 4     |
| Vocational Training:      | 1   | 5     | 6     |
| Graduate College Work:    | 0   | 3     | 3     |
| No Schooling:             | 1   | 1     | 2     |
| Unknown:                  | 2   | 1     | 3     |

The tabulation of occupations of the parents (Table VI) further shows a great socio-economic range from unskilled farm laborer, up the scale of skilled occupations, to those which required considerable special training and education, to college teacher. The largest group, however, represents those in unskilled and semi-skilled work.

TABLE VI

UNCLASSIFIED LISTING AND TABULATION OF THE OCCUPATIONS  
OF BOTH PARENTS OF THE 47 PILOT STUDY PARTICIPANTS  
AT THE TIME OF THEIR ACCEPTANCE INTO THE STUDY

| 15 MEN                   |                     |                       |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Father                   | Mother              | Spouse                |
| Carpenter - 2            | Housewife - 8       | Nurse - 1             |
| Farmer - 2               | Teacher - 2         | Sales Clerk - 1       |
| Electrician - 1          | Secretary - 2       | Bookkeeper - 1        |
| Maintenance Engineer - 1 | Factory Worker - 1  | Stenographer - 1      |
| Minister - 1             | Chambermaid - 1     | Secretary - 1         |
| Small Businessman - 1    | Sales Clerk - 1     | Housewife - 1         |
| Factory Foreman - 1      |                     |                       |
| Farm Laborer - 1         |                     |                       |
| Truck driver - 1         |                     |                       |
| Grocer - 1               |                     |                       |
| Machinist - 1            |                     |                       |
| Rancher - 1              |                     |                       |
| Miner - 1                |                     |                       |
| 32 WOMEN                 |                     |                       |
| Father                   | Mother              | Spouse                |
| Farm Laborer - 3         | Housewife - 21      | Teacher - 2           |
| Farmer - 3               | Teacher - 2         | College Teacher - 2   |
| Teacher - 2              | Practical Nurse - 2 | Student - 1           |
| Factory Foreman - 2      | Clerk - 2           | In Armed Services - 1 |
| Civil Service - 2        | Hospital            | Electrician - 1       |
| Self-employed - 2        | attendant - 1       | Farmer - 1            |
| Rancher - 2              | Day Work - 1        |                       |
| Salesman - 2             | Sales Clerk - 1     |                       |
| Gardener - 1             | Stenographer - 1    |                       |
| Minister - 1             | Not Stated - 1      |                       |
| Laborer - 1              |                     |                       |
| Real Estate Broker - 1   |                     |                       |
| Truck Driver - 1         |                     |                       |
| Grocer - 1               |                     |                       |
| Cabinetmaker - 1         |                     |                       |
| Carpenter - 1            |                     |                       |
| Electrician - 1          |                     |                       |
| Ret. Army Officer - 1    |                     |                       |
| Meat Cutter - 1          |                     |                       |
| Railway Clerk - 1        |                     |                       |
| Not stated - 1           |                     |                       |



Years of Residence in California and Birthplace. With so much said about the influx of population into California, a routine check of years of residence in California (Table VII) revealed the surprising information that 28 of the 47 were native-born and lifetime residents, with another 13 living in the state from ten to thirty-two years. Only four students in the entire group lived in California five years or less. Out-of-state birthplaces were Texas, Wisconsin, Kansas, Louisiana, Ohio, North Dakota, Arizona, Illinois, Oklahoma, New Jersey, Minnesota, Iowa, and Washington, and foreign countries of origin were Mexico and Yugoslavia.

TABLE VII

YEARS OF RESIDENCE IN CALIFORNIA OF THE 47 PILOT STUDY  
PARTICIPANTS AT THE TIME OF THEIR ACCEPTANCE INTO THE STUDY

| Years | Men | Women | Total |
|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| Life  | 6   | 22    | 28    |
| 2     | 2   | 1     | 3     |
| 5     | 1   | 0     | 1     |
| 9     | 0   | 2     | 2     |
| 10    | 3   | 0     | 3     |
| 12    | 0   | 1     | 1     |
| 14    | 0   | 1     | 1     |
| 15    | 0   | 2     | 2     |
| 17    | 1   | 2     | 3     |
| 18    | 1   | 0     | 1     |
| 20    | 1   | 0     | 1     |
| 32    | 0   | 1     | 1     |
| Total | 15  | 32    | 47    |

Ethnic Origin. One of the phases of the Pilot Study in its demonstration of tapping new sources of teacher supply related to an effort to find candidates of minority groups (no table) who would not ordinarily look to teaching as a vocational choice. Of the 47 who completed the program, 29 were of Northern European descent (English, Irish, Scottish, Swedish, German, Austrian, and combinations thereof); 6 were of Italian background; one French, and one of Portuguese descent; two were of French-Canadian descent; two were Slavic (one born in Yugoslavia, and one descended from Czechoslovakian ancestry); two were of Mexican-American, and two of Spanish-American ancestry; and two were Negro. No students of Oriental descent applied during the Pilot Study, but in the following year, when the program was continued by the School of Education, three Japanese-American women applied and were accepted.

Academic Ability and Personal Characteristics. For Group I, an estimate of academic ability was made by using scores from whichever tests applied, in conjunction with the high school and junior college grades and courses. It included consideration of the kind and extent of work experience while enrolled, co-curricular activities,

and personal history of time spent in community organizations and activities. The junior college folders had some high school records, and in four cases, brief elementary school records.

Also for Group I, personal characteristics were checked with some help from personality type tests. Mainly counselors, teachers, and the applicants' folders furnished the information used to supplement that gained directly from interviews. An attempt was made in this area to approximate standards of the Elementary Credential Committee. Motivation to be a teacher, especially since the program had attracted applicants from majors other than Education who had started and worked toward quite different goals in junior college, was recognized as very difficult to determine. Although not considered final nor very reliable, the interview was of necessity highly important in making a judgment. A suggestion of another faculty member was used to "structure" part of the vocational interview by asking the applicant to recall his experience with a teacher he liked especially well in the elementary grades. Then he was asked to explain as well as he could why he liked the teacher. Conversely, he was asked to do the same about a teacher he disliked. It was often possible to tell from the discussions how an applicant looked at teaching in terms of stimulating and helping a child to learn.

Selection of candidates for Group II followed the same pattern established for Group I with the advantage of more time in which to consider more detailed evidence of suitability for the program, and

with the added advantage of experience upon which to base a sharper awareness of the importance of such aspects as a sense of responsibility as evidenced by class cuts and tardiness; the importance of time, especially in relation to part-time work; and a search for more effective ways to determine the maturity of the student.

Academic ability of Group II was more carefully assessed, and in all cases it was estimated with help of academic ability tests, academic achievement tests, and past academic records. American Council on Education Psychological Examination scores were available for all but one of this group. At this time the ACE test scores were considered more reliable at the upper ranges than at the lower end of the distribution as expressed in percentiles. All low ACE percentiles were checked with individual intelligence tests. Percentiles as low as five did not automatically exclude applicants. The Wechsler-Bellevue Intelligence Scale was administered to several who were low on pencil and paper type tests. Some scores were available from high schools and elementary schools on a variety of scholastic aptitude or I.Q. tests.

The Cooperative General Culture test was given as an achievement test to all applicants. The scores on history, social studies, literature, science, fine arts, mathematics, and a total of these five were compared with the College of the Pacific sophomore norms derived from distribution accumulated over the previous four years. Again, there was no attempt to apply a high cutting score, but these test performances were given consideration in the final selection or rejection of an applicant.

Past school records were studied with the Grade Point Average



requirement for student teaching in mind.

Similarly, personality characteristics were studied more carefully. The students for whom a recent pencil and paper type of personality indicator was not available were given the Adjustment Inventory as an aid to interviewing. Where there were indications of poor adjustment or possible low motivation toward vocational success the Thematic Apperception Test was also used. Attendance records were also more carefully checked. Excessive absences or too frequent tardiness was considered a possible indication of poor vocational orientation for a job requiring regularity and punctuality. Another factor which assumed importance was that of the student's ability to recognize time limitations which might involve postponing certain desired extra-curricular activities until the following year. Many of the students making inquiry about the program, for instance, were advised to proceed according to the regular four-year plan if at all possible so that the maturing process of growth and two more years of college life might better prepare them for ultimate vocational responsibility.

For the Pilot Study Group, it became evident early in the experience with Group I that all the factors which led to their selection also served to maintain a high degree of persistent motivation as they proceeded with the program. These elements were kept in mind in the selection of the two subsequent groups. Also, as a barometer of persistence and stamina to achieve a goal, the necessity of going to school continuously through two summers may have served as an effective screening device.

By the time the two interviewers set dates to begin selection for Group III there was widespread information about the program on all three college campuses involved, in the communities at large through newspaper publicity, and from Pilot Study students themselves who were either completing the program or were in the process of going through the program. There was helpful screening on the part of some counselors in the junior colleges, and the kinds of information previously asked for were anticipated to some extent and made readily available to the interviewers. In addition to the factors highlighted for Group II, continuing experience with the students in the program brought other factors into focus, such as creativity, personal flexibility and spontaneity in classroom situations, and the ability to meet a variety of situations successfully. While fully aware from the beginning of these as attributes of the successful classroom teacher, the interviewers found themselves looking more closely at academic records, especially of the straight A students, to determine how much of the high grade point represented a skill in grade-getting and how much represented a truly alive and creative mind and personality. At least the question was raised. A satisfactory answer has yet to be found.

For Group III, experience by this time seemed to encourage continued use of the General Culture Test with College of the Pacific norms. This group of five sub-tests had been administered early in the first Summer Session for Group I, and before the selection of Group II. Familiarity with the various strengths and weaknesses of individuals in the first two groups with respect to academic preparation

suggested a sufficiently high curricular validity for the test scores to make it a useful indicator of breadth and depth of course content retained at the end of the second college year. Scholastic aptitude measurements were again carefully checked by using individual tests where there seemed to be reason for a closer estimate than was shown by junior college test records.

Personality characteristics were explored with the same information-gaining techniques used previously. The Adjustment Inventory and the Thematic Apperception Test were used most frequently. However, noticeable criteria changes made some differences in consideration of available information. For example, attendance office records were more carefully checked, and more comprehensive study of activities involving self-expression was required.

With the data at hand on the selection procedures for all three groups, including some of the changing emphases dictated by experience, it was realized that only a longer term observation of all three groups could be satisfactory for evaluation of both criteria and information-gaining techniques.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE PROGRAM

The academic and professional training phases of the Pilot Study program involved certain significant changes in course sequence and in continuous personal contact with the faculty. Each group had its own faculty advisor-supervisor who first came to know the students in their fall semester work in the basic methods course, followed them in their practice teaching in the spring semester, continued close supervision of their work throughout the student's first on-the-job teaching year, and simultaneously had the students in the six-units sequence of Child Growth and Development and Principles of Elementary Education throughout that same year. This same faculty member also served to advise the students about planning other college courses, and acted as the student's college counselor.

One major change was to invert the normal sequence of the professional courses which the regular credential candidates followed in their junior year. Instead of starting in the Fall with the combined six-unit course in Child Growth and Development and Principles of Elementary Education and following in the Spring with the basic methods block course, the Pilot Study groups began in the Fall with the methods course and followed in the Spring with student teaching. The second major change involving sequence of courses pertained to the students' taking the six units mentioned above while being supervised by the College on a full-time paid teaching job (the internship). Otherwise the students fulfilled all course requirements the College for the bachelor's degree and teaching credential,



usually during the summer and fall sessions.

1. Experience with the classes in Methods in Elementary Education.

The Methods classes were taught quite differently by the three college advisor-supervisors, but the one feature in common which developed especially to meet the needs of the Pilot Study students and which was later incorporated as a valuable adjunct to the regular college teacher education program was the observation of classes in action in the public schools. Observation began early in the student's work in Methods. In this course, Pilot Study students were in a regular college class with other students; and, as one instructor put it, it took almost two months for him to begin to distinguish Pilot Study students from the others. He felt this had the advantage of keeping him from considering these students as an experimental group and therefore not to be treated in any way different from other students this early in their college work, especially since the belief among the faculty was that the Pilot Study students should get the "feel" of as much college life and atmosphere as possible as a broad base for their intensive pre-professional training.

It is interesting to note how two of the instructors (who are also referred to as advisor-supervisors) described their experiences with the Methods class with Pilot Study students among the class members:

The second Pilot Group started its formal professional educational work during the summer session of 1956. The group did not meet as a group until September 1956 at which time they met at 9:00 a.m. each school day for fifty minutes' instruction in a course called Methods in Elementary Education. There were 25 class members in all. Nineteen of the class members,

14 women and 5 men, were members of the second pilot group.

The course was the usual theory course taught to all persons who prepare themselves at the College of the Pacific to become elementary school teachers. . . The instructor started the instruction by a study of arithmetic methods and curriculum, followed by reading and the other language arts, and ended the course with a study of social studies methods and curriculum.

No attempt was made to make this course any different from the same course as taught to other groups. Assignments were made in the basic texts, and readings were required from books placed on reserve in the College Library. Tests were administered at the rate of about two per month throughout the semester. The assignments also required the students to study the children's basic texts. . . and the students were also required to acquaint themselves with children's texts which were other than the State adopted texts.

Student's participation in class was mainly discussion, note-taking, and an occasional report to the class. Role playing as a method of instruction took place only three times in the entire semester.

Whereas another of the advisor-supervisors reported:

The third pilot group met for the first time with their college advisor in September of 1957. Prior to this they had had summer session classes together and had some acquaintance with one another. None of them was known to the advisor until they met at the opening of the course, Methods in Elementary Education. The group consisted of 18 students, 12 women and 6 men, who seemed, in general, to have little in common except the desire to become teachers.

A brief discussion revealed the usual number of over-willing participants and only three non-participants. At the close of the first period each person was asked to write a statement of what he considered the purpose of elementary education to be, and, in the light of his stated purpose, what he expected to gain from the methods course.

Since the records revealed that none of these students had had courses dealing with the growth and development of children and that their backgrounds in sociology were meager (to put it mildly) it seemed necessary to attempt to give at least some concepts of these areas in order that there might be some criteria for setting up and evaluating goals and methods of instruction. This preview of growth and development and social functions proceeded while an evaluation of the students' statements regarding purposes of education and methods took place.

These statements revealed the following:

Three students' papers were wordy and vague with no answers to the questions.

Four students were able to make an adequate statement of goals, but their expectations in methods had no relationship to the purposes.

Seven students stated goals in terms of skill subjects, and their expectations in methods indicated a desire for specific "tricks".

Four students made understanding statements both of goals and methods.

All students included somewhere in their statements a need for methods of classroom control.

Bearing the needs of the students in mind the course was organized around three areas. The major goals being as follows:

I. To Teach Method by Example

1. To create a dynamic group that could solve problems through group discussion.
2. To develop an understanding of group dynamics as a pooling of knowledge having a bearing on the problem and finding a better answer than one alone can find.
3. To show the need for knowledge in the solution of problems.
4. To show the need for skills in obtaining and organizing information.

II. To Teach Specific Techniques in Various Elementary School Content and Skill Areas

1. To develop understanding of techniques of motivation, presentation, demonstration and evaluation of teaching skills.
2. To develop an understanding of the sequential development of skills.
3. To develop understanding of learnings that take place as a result of the methods used in teaching.

Lecture, text book, and supplementary readings provided the material of instruction. Sometime during the course each student participated in a panel discussion, a parent interview (role playing), a demonstration of the presentation of a skill, and each gave a brief report of a significant book or article. In each of these activities the students with the instructor set up criteria for evaluating the work of the panel or individual and each turned in the evaluation to the instructor. These student evaluations served several purposes: to give the instructor an idea of the discernment of individual students; to show how effectively the teaching of methods was functioning; and to serve as help in grading the students.



Observation. During the semester students were assigned to and elementary school classroom for from one to two hours a week. This part of the program developed during the three years to the point where, from passive observation, at first, the students increasingly helped the teacher until, by the time Group III was in the program, a suggested list of participating activities was distributed to the supervising teacher in the public school (see Appendix C), and the students themselves were spending an average of three hours a week in this activity. The observations of the students were used as a basis of class discussion to tie in theory and practice. A compilation of opportunities for observation for one group showed the following results:

One student had no opportunity for observation.  
The greatest numbers of opportunities for participation were in:

- Preparation of seat work
- Helping prepare art materials
- Helping a child who had been absent
- Assisting at games and folk dancing
- Helping a child who has been isolated as a disciplinary measure
- Reading to children
- Correcting papers
- Pronouncing spelling words for a class
- Playing games during physical education
- Helping the teacher collect milk money

On occasion, observation students ate lunch with the staff in the teachers' room, went on a field trip with the class, or attended a P.T.A. meeting.

Students themselves stated that the observation experience often made them feel at home in the elementary classroom and in the total school environment. It frequently gave them something very tangible to talk about in the Methods class. It gave them specific ideas on



arithmetic, reading or social studies, for example, to share with their classmates. It made them feel more comfortable with children, but it sometimes made them wonder why the methods the teacher was using were so different from those which they were learning about in the Methods class. One student found out he did not want to teach upper grades, and another came to the realization that there were certainly many levels of ability in one classroom.

One supervisor commented that the individualized observation operating concurrently with the methods class showed strong evidence that each reinforced the other and gave the students a sense of marked assurance when they began student teaching.

2. Student Teaching Experiences. Pilot student placements for student teaching were made in the same way assignments were arranged for students in the regular program. One college supervisor reported that the pilot group, as a result of the intensive program of active observation during the first semester, seemed more self-confident and more eager to get into the full responsibility of teaching as quickly as possible than those in the regular program. Only a few members of the group seemed insecure, while some displayed so much self-assurance that they had to be restrained. Very quickly the principals of several schools recommended to their superintendents that initial steps be taken to employ members of the Pilot Group for the

coming year. This was a satisfying assurance that the Pilot program was practical and showed promise of fulfilling its objectives. College supervisor evaluation of the student teaching program indicated that most of the principals seemed to prefer leaving the program entirely to the supervising teacher and the college supervisor. However, about a third of the principals showed concern for the success of the student teachers as was evidenced by visits to the classroom, evaluation of the student teachers with the supervising teacher and college supervisor, and inclusion of students in building activities and professional meetings. In a few cases special abilities of students were exploited to the detriment of their student teaching experiences.

About one-half of the supervising teachers seemed to have some understanding of their job as training teachers. About a fourth expressed a desire for assistance to achieve success as training teachers, while some seemed entirely unaware of their training function.

It was found that short individual conferences by the college supervisors with Pilot student-teachers, and student-teacher group meetings during directed teaching periods were not adequate to relate classroom procedures to previously learned theory and methods. For example, some of the practical difficulties at first encountered were described thus:

In the matter of arranging conferences it proved impossible to have regular appointments. Yard duty, cafeteria duty, teachers' meetings, P.T.A. meetings, college classes for students and sometimes teachers, and a multiplicity of other activities all took precedence over the needs of the student teaching program. Throughout the entire semester only five conferences of adequate professional quality were achieved. Two of these involved the same people. This experience would seem to indicate

that some arrangement for specific, required conferences - either small group or individual - should be made a part of the student teaching program.

It was also found that there is a considerable variation in the matter of handling and use of instructional materials in the various districts involved. Curriculum materials and guides provided for teachers are sometimes slavishly adhered to and sometimes completely disregarded. There seemed, however, to be consistent high regard for text books and the accompanying manuals in all areas.

Questions and comments of the students regarding procedures provided opportunity for evaluation in a very limited degree. It seemed advisable to reserve the consideration of some of these problems until the students were in their own classrooms in the fall. The following are, however, some significant comments regarding the student teaching experience:

"I was just beginning to get a good feeling about it when I had to change"

"I collected dozens of work sheets that I can use for busy work"

"I never did get so I could make my program come out in the time I had. The teacher did not mind"

"The teacher never helped me; she just took back the class"

"The best thing about student teaching is getting to feel secure in the classroom"

"I learned the necessity of careful planning"

3. The Internship. The most unexpected and significant development that resulted from the entire Pilot Study grew out of the experience with what has since come to be called the Internship. The Internship was the full year of full-time salaried teaching under the close supervision of a college advisor-supervisor carried concurrently with six units of college seminar throughout the academic year. The strength and value of the internship to the student, to the employing school district, and to professional growth became evident about halfway through the first year's internship of Group I. Also, visiting consultants\* independently pointed

---

\*Merle Elliott, Director of Educational Research of the Oakland City Schools; Lucien Kinney, Professor of Education, Stanford University; Charles E. Hamilton, Teacher Education Executive of the Commission on Teacher Education of the California Teachers Association; and Hugh M. Bell, Professor of Psychology, Chico State College.

to the internship as the crucial feature in giving the accelerated program its strength, and as an indicator of a desirable trend in all future teacher education.

The internship program made it possible for three college staff members, with quite different philosophies and techniques, to work closely with three reasonably representative groups of students interested in becoming teachers and to have a remarkable degree of success in seeing them through the beginning year of teaching.

All students who had remained with the program to this point received contracts within fifty miles of the College of the Pacific. Grade assignments were made in all of the elementary grades.

It is not possible, of course, to state specifically how many students were "saved" for the profession by the extended supervision of the internship program. The fact that they went into their beginning year six units short of the regular program requirements may have put some at an initial disadvantage. Also, in one instance it was necessary to bring in a second supervisor from the College for a half day every day for three weeks to work with a Pilot teacher. This special attention was later credited with saving that young teacher, who today is thought to be one of the better teachers in the school system. It is probably a conservative estimate to say that one-fifth of the total number of teachers would not have survived into the second and third years of teaching without the initial help of the College supervisors. To date none has failed as a teacher.



Many were definitely upgraded to the point where they are now superior teachers. In a few cases the individual were so outstanding that they probably would have been superior teachers without the internship.

One supervisor noted that, in all cases where the beginning pilot teacher had trouble establishing himself, he had been assigned a split grade or his principal was relatively ineffective as a classroom supervisor. There were instances of both high and low potential teachers being assigned to split grade under inexperienced principals, and in each instance they were having difficulty with teaching. It is to be noted also that, in other cases, beginning teachers who were considered of fairly low potential had little trouble in situations where the number of pupils was small and the principal was both experienced and helpful.

One of the College supervisors summarized this phase of the experience as follows:

Throughout the first semester of the initial teaching experience of the students, the College supervisor made it a policy to visit each classroom and Pilot student at least once every two weeks. The initial contact was made through the principal of the school, and each time thereafter the principal knew beforehand when the student was to be observed. In this way, the College supervisor had an opportunity to share information with the principal, and, if it seemed necessary to correct certain matters or to obtain help as far as the Pilot teacher was concerned, that was accomplished through proper administrative channels and with the mutual consent of the College supervisor and the school administrator. The team work, plus any special supervisor whose help at times was thought necessary, proved to be an effective aid to the solution of the various problems which confronted these beginning teachers.

It should also be noted that, when a teacher needed help, the supervisor might return to that classroom several times in two weeks.

It was the experience of the College supervisor that, if the young beginning teacher could be helped during the first months of the school year, not nearly the same amount of help was needed as the school year progressed.

It is of interest to note that, in all cases where the beginning Pilot teacher had trouble in establishing himself as a classroom teacher, either he had been assigned a split grade or that his principal was relatively unskilled as a classroom supervisor. In two cases, when the beginning teacher had trouble, he had been assigned a split grade in a school where the principal was a beginning principal. One of these teachers was a poor beginning prospect, but the other one was one of the best teacher potentials of the group. Three other beginning Pilot teachers had considerable difficulty in establishing themselves, and in all three cases, the principal was not an effective classroom supervisor. It is also true that all three of these beginners had somewhat lower teacher potential (defined as a combination of one or more of the following characteristics: (1) a low academic average; (2) a meager or very limited background of experience, or at least a background of cultural deprivation which is associated with low socio-economic level homes; and (3) a rigid personality) than did the other members of the Group; but it is interesting to note that two of the three are now employed in the same schools and that the third, after a year of graduate work, expects to return to the classroom. One other low potential beginning teacher had little trouble. This was possibly because she was placed in a rural school under an experienced principal and in a room of only twenty-five pupils. All of the others discussed above, except one, had classrooms which contained from thirty-five to forty-two pupils.

Before the Internships started, conferences were held with school representative. As soon as the College knew where the various members of the group were to be employed, meetings were arranged, with the approval of the superintendents concerned, and of the principals and school consultants who would be working with Pilot teachers during the next year. The purpose of the meetings was to familiarize these groups with the main features of the Internship year of the Pilot Study. For example, they were made aware of the fact that class work in Child Growth and Development and Principles of Elementary Education would have to be completed during the school year. Also the implications of

College of the Pacific sharing in supervision of the classroom teaching during the first year of teaching were explored. This seemed important so that there would be no conflict of loyalty and responsibility in the minds of the Pilot teachers.

Using the discussion which resulted from these meeting, the College prepared a report (see Appendix F) to be issued to the new teachers, their district consultants, their principals, and their superintendents as the new term was about to open.

Some of the advantages of these Internship placements appeared to be as follows:

1. Students were placed as first year teachers in communities where they were already known.
2. Some of the students were placed in schools where they had been student-teachers.
3. Students were usually placed in the grade of their choice.
4. The college supervisor was acquainted with nearly all of the building principals.
5. The college supervisor had the group in class throughout the entire year.
6. The content of the class discussions, Human Growth and Development the first semester and Principles of Elementary Education the second semester combined equally with the goals of evaluating and upgrading the quality of classroom instruction.

Some disadvantages also evident were as follows:

1. A few teachers were placed in schools where the principal taught full time.
2. Some teachers were employed with the understanding that they had responsibilities in addition to teaching.
3. Some of the teachers were in buildings where the principals did no supervising.

The supervisors felt that the beginning teachers should be placed in favorable beginning situations. This meant to begin:

- (1) in a low pupil-teacher ratio situation;
- (2) in a room with one grade or a reduced pupil-teacher ratio in a split-graded room;
- (3) with a principal who is an effective classroom supervisor.



Much greater security was shown by beginning teachers in the building where the principals had expressed their interest in the program and gave some supervision.

Some beginning teachers were assigned to "helping" teachers who were in the same building teaching the same grade. They all liked the idea, but many reported the teachers used methods different from those taught by the College. Also, many of the Pilot teachers expressed surprise at the antagonism of some regular teachers to supervision.

The same advantages which applied in student teaching continued to an even greater degree when the Pilot students became full-time teachers. The college supervisor, after a whole year of close association with the Pilot student, was even in a more strategic position to interpret the new responsibilities of being a regular teacher. The college supervisor, too, was of definite assistance to the principal in understanding his new Pilot teacher more quickly.

One supervisor noted that the beginning teachers were making fundamental errors due to a lack of knowledge concerning child growth and development. The suggestion was that no beginning teacher should enter teaching without some understanding of child growth and development, preferably a psychology course taught by a psychologist. This lack seemed generally noted, but in some instances the classroom observation, by the supervisor where difficulties were noted, revealed that teachers were usually able to find the reason for the breakdown in the failure to plan for and to gear the program to the abilities of the children. Specific techniques became understandable for most of



the teachers to some degree and fell into their proper places as their suitability to the maturity level of the children was tested.

During this time there seemed, however, to be developing a considerable spread in the ability and willingness of teachers to relate so-called theory to practice. Some of the Pilot teachers who seemed to do rather well in academic work showed a resistance to self-evaluation in the classroom teaching situation.

Students' Evaluation of Internship:

The students themselves were also given the opportunity to evaluate the internship program from the very beginning, as described by one of the college supervisors:

A quick check-up on how the total internship program was appealing to the members of the class at any time was secured by a simple yes-no-doubtful technique (Appendix D). The supervisor prepared 10 or 15 or even more questions from time to time to suit developments. These were numbered and read orally to the class who responded to each question by a check (✓) in the "yes" or "no" or "doubtful" column. Emphasis was placed upon the complete anonymity of the student. Administering this type of questionnaire and scoring the results required very little time, but it served as a continuous self-check on the instructor, to keep theory and practice appropriately geared to one another. One interesting and desirable concomitant of the process was that the Pilot teachers tended to use the technique with their own classes even down to the first grade.

On the basis of their direct experience with the Pilot Study students, the college supervisors concurred in these general observations:

1. It is possible to select persons from the junior college who can become acceptable elementary classroom teachers at all

- grade levels after fifteen months of intensive formal education.
2. There is a potential supply of classroom teachers among minority groups and among the lower socio-economic levels of the population of the Central Valley of California.
  3. College supervision under the present conditions for at least the first semester after the teachers start teaching would cause more beginning teachers to be successful and, hence, would lower materially the dropout rate of beginning teachers.
  4. Many school principals do not understand classroom supervision and are, therefore, unable to help effectively the beginning teacher who needs help. If this help were made available there would be fewer dropouts.
  5. The Methods course should be taught at the same time that the students are observing and working in individual classrooms. Theory and practice must be taught together.
  6. Students should be supervised in their student teaching by the same persons who taught their general Methods class.
  7. Beginning teachers should be placed in favorable beginning assignments. This means being placed (1) in a low pupil-teacher ration situation; (2) with one grade in the room, or a reduced pupil-teacher ratio in a split-graded room; and (3) with a principal who is an effective classroom supervisor.

4. The Concurrent Seminars. Another new feature of the Pilot Study was the requirement that the Pilot students take the required courses in Child Growth and Development and the Principles of Elementary Education as on-campus seminars during the entire

year of their Internship. The experience of the advisor-supervisor of Group I in adapting the conventional courses to the needs of the Pilot Study students served as a base pattern. The college supervisors of Groups II and III, however, found that adaptations had to be made continuously, although the same objectives were held, and similar results came about for all three groups.

These courses were taken by other students during the first semester of the junior year, but for the Pilot Study students, the deferring of these courses was found to have a distinct advantage, as discussed by the college-supervisor of Group I:

This theory course had the marked advantage to the student of being taken at the time when he was coming to grips with the realistic problems of the teacher in the classroom with 30 or 35 children. It had meaning and immediate value. However, it presented the serious difficulty of being taken at a time when the burden of teaching was at its greatest. The refinement of lesson planning, mastering the rudimentary techniques of classroom control and carrying the full load of classroom instruction, the Pilot teacher faced very much on his own for the first time. There was no supervising teacher at his elbow. Teaching was a big load in itself.

Obviously it was not practical for the Pilot teachers to meet as a class group three one-hour periods a week in the conventional college manner. The expense of travel alone for several of the group would be prohibitively expensive, to say nothing of the extent to which needed time for lesson planning and relaxation would be interrupted. For these reasons a two-hour meeting every other week was agreed upon as being the most practical. But the assignment in reading and the preparation of reports were equal in amount to a normal 3-unit course each semester, plus sufficient work to compensate for the four hours omitted each fortnight from class attendance. However, since they were seniors, and already had had student teaching, and were motivated by the actual business of teaching on their own, they were able to cover these assignments with greater understanding and with less preparation time than beginning juniors. It will be remembered that in the normal credential program this course is taken when the student is a low junior. One additional point in connection with the infrequency of class meeting times should be mentioned. That is the missing of one meeting resulted in an interval without class contact of practically a whole month. Even tardiness was a signal for investigation and counseling, which sometimes meant

merely help in the organization of a busy life or assistance in cutting down the work load.

Texts. Since this program of instruction lacked precedent at the College of the Pacific, the advisor sought the advice of several of his colleagues in both the education and psychology fields as to the choice of texts. The list finally agreed upon included:

- |                                   |                                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Hymes, James L.,               | <u>Behavior and Misbehavior</u><br>Prentice-Hall, 1955                                      |
| 2. _____,                         | <u>A Child Development Point of View</u> , Prentice-Hall, 1955                              |
| 3. Jenkins, Gladys G., et al,     | <u>These Are Your Children</u> ,<br>(enlarged edition), 1949                                |
| 4. Shaftel, George and Fannie R., | <u>Role Playing the Problem Story</u> ,<br>Nat'l Conference of Christians<br>and Jews, 1952 |
| 5. Taba, Hilda, et al,            | <u>Diagnosing Human Relations Needs</u> ,<br>American Council on Education,<br>1955         |
| 6. Wiles, Kimball,                | <u>Teaching for Better Schools</u> ,<br>Prentice-Hall, 1953                                 |

The numerous texts are accounted for by the fact that more time needed to be put into reading than would be advisable in most six units of course work. The Taba and Shaftel material became necessary when advantage was taken of three lectures by Dr. Fannie Shaftel of Stanford University which were made available in Stockton to the Pilot Group.

Agenda for the Class Meetings. The class meetings lent themselves to a wide range of activities which were motivated to a large degree by the students' strong desire to see one another and to share experiences during the formal class time as well as before and after class. The two hours passed so very quickly that without being too obvious or too systematic the instructor had to keep in mind the goals which he and the class considered important for each evening.



Besides short quizzes on the reading assignments, some of the activities which proved rewarding were:

1. Class discussion of important phases of the text assignment - those which the instructor had observed to tie in with the more common achievements or problems of the group in his round of visitation.
2. Hearing progress reports as a class group from various members who were making anecdotal records of problem children in their respective classes.
3. Hearing something quite significant which members had learned in the human relations of the classroom by using such other techniques as role playing, the sociogram, three wishes, the play, open-end questions, the week-end or overnight diary, and others.
4. Dividing the class into groups, and, from a variety of practical problems which they and the instructor suggested, allowing time for a 15 or 20 minute buzz session to be followed up by summary reports. The instructor, in circulating from group to group, shared, but usually listened, in order to determine the quality of thinking which each member was contributing to the discussion.
5. Bringing to the class displays of work done by their children or setting up interest centers which were found to be especially appealing to children. Even the work of children of colleagues in their respective schools was borrowed and displayed for the new ideas which it furnished.

Class Bulletin Useful. Very early in the on-campus course it became apparent that the agenda formulated for the next meeting, usually growing out of group planning, were inaccurately or partially remembered because of the long interval between classes. This led to the preparation by the instructor of a follow-up bulletin, (Appendix E), emphasizing the assignment. This proved to be very helpful, and in time the bulletin was expanded to include a variety of announcements such as those dealing with campus items of particular concern to seniors. Among these were matters relating to the graduate record examination, picture-taking for the Naranjado and securing the cap and gown for graduation. Also there were long range due dates of reports, the conclusions reached by the group in important class discussions of a subject, and progress reports in long term projects undertaken. In brief, the bulletins kept both class and teacher from forgetting important matters which could easily be overlooked by the nature of the program.

The bulletins were issued in duplicate so that the principal might also have a copy and thus keep fully informed of the campus course of the Pilot teacher. The principals were encouraged to keep a complete file of these announcement bulletins for ready

reference. Various methods of distribution were followed, but the practice of mailing two copies to the principal shortly after the class meeting seemed to work best.

Specific Teaching Techniques Shared. Some of the many specific teaching techniques which the students shared with each other as helpful practices are listed below. They were transmitted through class discussions, buzz sessions and reports, or informally exchanged before and after class.

1. Always being on the lookout for the special talents which children possess and once discovered, putting these talents to use for the individual's self-esteem and the class's appreciation of each other. One of the Pilot teachers discovered that one of the boys in his room could play the piano beautifully. The boy had a physical difficulty which embarrassed him at times and tended to isolate him from the others. When his classmates realized his special ability, they became very proud of him and found numerous situations in which he could play for them.
2. Seeking ways of reducing the numerous routines of the classroom such as collecting milk money, issuing cafeteria tickets, distributing and collecting P.E. equipment, and keeping desks and storage space orderly with the minimum consumption of teacher time.
3. Making assignments which are fully understood and which are sufficiently flexible to keep all members of the group or class profitably occupied. This included multiple assignments for the more capable pupils as well as other devices.
4. Working for self reliance and independence in class groups, in reading for example, so that pupils may work effectively together while the teacher works with another group.
5. Learning to move about the classroom while groups or the whole class is working and quietly observing or helping first one pupil and then another.
6. Learning how to reprimand a pupil who deserves it so privately that the rest of the class is unaware of it.
7. Becoming so sensitive to children at whatever they may be doing in a class or group, to discerning quite accurately the degree of interest which each possesses for the thing at hand, much as a skilled speaker is sensitive to his audience.
8. Preparing a Christmas program that is satisfying to the children, one that appeals to other classes and to parents without being too costly in time and materials.

9. Developing centers of interest which are a continuing appeal to children and are enriching to the overall instructional program.
10. Involving children in making the room attractive to them in beauty and utility - a place where they want to be.
11. Providing for rainy day recesses and noons with games brought from home and secured from other sources so that the children are happily occupied in an orderly fashion.
12. Orienting next year's class during the closing week of school by using the most interesting of the resources of the present class for a 15-minute period.
13. Learning how to be firm and formal with full class acceptance when the situation requires it.
14. Selecting and using appropriate audio-visual aids materials.
15. Conducting the culmination of a social studies unit with the parents as guests without such "perfection" as to destroy the spontaneity of the children.

These are only representative of many techniques which the group shared with each other. The sharing experience was especially enriching since the students themselves represented many different schools, using a variety of approaches to classroom teaching.

5. The Key Role of the School Principal. Another unexpected development in the Pilot Study was the emergence of the key role which is played by the school principal in the development of professional competence in the beginning teacher. Although the College staff was aware of his importance in the multi-phased functions which the principal's job requires, it was only as the College-supervisors followed consistently the progress of the Pilot Study interns that the full significance of the principal's influence on the beginning classroom teacher's work assumed dimensions of importance which the teaching profession as a whole had by and large insufficiently recognized.

A description of how the relationship to principals was established with Group I and followed thereafter may, therefore, have pertinence at this point:



Orientation of Principals. The orientation of the first principals to have the Pilot study teachers as members of their staffs was accomplished by meetings called by administrators from the Stockton Unified School District, the Modesto City Schools, and the San Joaquin County Schools late in the Spring of 1955.

A general overview of the Pilot Study program was presented by the college supervisors of Group I. This was followed by a thorough discussion, and agreement reached as to the anticipated responsibilities which the principal and college supervisor would be expected to carry, mutually and separately, in supervising the Pilot Study teacher on the job. An understanding of the cooperative relationship between the principal and the college supervisor, as far as supervision was concerned, was one of the major outgrowths of these meetings.

A detailed written report (Appendix F) covering these matters was issued to each principal and to all of the Pilot Study teachers. At the first opportunity after school opened, the main features of this working agreement were discussed individually with the principals and with the Pilot teachers as a group. It was well that this was done because during the summertime some of the items of the plan had been forgotten or were not fully understood in the first place. The wisdom of these precautions was evident on several occasions during the year when suggested departures were proposed, but in each case were easily settled by reference to the agreed plan. The most common proposal was made by the men of the Pilot group to permit them to take jobs for supplementary incomes. Not to have held the line would have greatly diminished the effectiveness of the internship program. Another proposed activity, which at first glance might seem very plausible, could handicap rather than help the internship, namely, the assignment by the principal of the Pilot teacher to a local inservice course. No matter how excellent the course, it imposes too heavy a load. This was learned during the past year when a Pilot teacher of high academic ability almost broke under the load. Also, the assigning of the Pilot teacher to an important all-school task at least during the first semester might prove too much. Even the exchange of classes in music, folk dancing, science, and in other areas where the Pilot teacher is highly competent could present a worrisome situation should the other class be difficult to manage, or should his own class lose needed continuity of supervision.

Principal Key Person. The college supervisor's effectiveness in helping the Pilot teacher grow to the maximum for his potential is impossible without the sympathetic and understanding support of his principal.

Not only is the principal able to give daily encouragement but other vital assistance to the Pilot teacher when it is most needed, and when the college supervisor may be far away. Besides that, he can help secure essential texts, supplies, and other aids



to fan the spark of enthusiasm just as it begins to glow, not days later. Moreover he can recruit his vice-principal and consultant for special assistance or see that those resourceful teachers, present in every building, take a special interest in the beginner. In several instances the tide was turned by the timely help, direct or indirect, of the principal.

Sometimes intervening holidays or conflicting assignments may cause three weeks during the first semester to elapse between the visits of the college supervisor. It pays then if possible to see the principal in advance of seeing the teacher, to be brought up to date on the latter's progress. Sometimes the information is extremely valuable for observation and in counseling. It can save a serious error of judgement on the supervisor's part. Often, in addition, a brief follow-up visit with the principal pays, this depending upon the circumstances.

All this implies that the supervisor should seldom miss seeing the principal. It is well to know his schedule of meetings with the superintendent, or when he may be away from the building for other reasons. The flexibility of the supervisor's program permits attention to these details. Sometimes the principal can be reached later by local phone. In fact, the principal has a large stake in the teacher's growth.

It is the principal who can arrange for valuable experiences for the intern. For example: The supervisor may ask permission for the Pilot teacher to see an especially good teaching demonstration in arithmetic in another school, or the supervisor may ask that the yard duty assignment be varied in such a way that the Pilot teacher may supervise children of all grade levels. This broader contact with children of the whole school may give greater reality to the college campus course in Child Growth and Development in progress at the moment. Likewise, the cafeteria assignment of the Pilot teacher may be modified to be of maximum value to his concurrent campus course.

Moreover, when the chips are down and the Pilot teacher is really in trouble, the principal may be asked to study the personnel of the class to see if a certain boy who is most uncooperative may not actually be eligible for transfer to the M.R. class. In addition, the principal might be urged to limit temporarily the assignment of newly arriving pupils to the Pilot teacher's class. He might also be of inestimable value in lightening the pressure caused by a severely disturbed child who may cause the Pilot teacher more concern than all of the rest of his class put together.

On the other hand, should it be necessary to have a showdown with a Pilot teacher who is wantonly violating the most acceptable procedures in dealing with children, and this has happened, a three-way conference between Pilot teacher, the

college supervisor, and the principal, requiring considerable time could result in saving the situation.

Incidentally, it is well to keep the channels of communication continually open with the principal; also relationships with the City Superintendent's and the County Superintendent's staff members whose duties bring them in contact with the Pilot program must be carefully watched. For example: the supervisor working in schools in two counties finds outstanding teaching in almost every aspect of elementary instruction. When a Pilot teacher is in need of observing an expert in the phase of teaching where he is weak, arrangements for such visitation can be easily made with the principals of the schools concerned. However, policy for such visitation must be cleared with the superintendent's office too. Especially is this necessary if a Pilot teacher from a school in one county is sent to a school in another county. In an informal program such as our Pilot study, freedom of action in seizing upon a good idea need not be curtailed, providing the supervisor is aware of the various interrelationships which exist where so many people are involved.

Evaluation of Pilot Teacher by the Principal. Evaluation of the Pilot teacher was carried out cooperatively by the principal and teacher in October, January, and May. Each had a copy of the evaluation form (Appendix G), and results were compared and discussed together.

This type of evaluation, it will be noted, was quite different from the official rating which the principal in most instances prepared at stated intervals for his superintendent. It definitely prevented the "halo" effect directly or in reverse. That is, for example, the principal selected not more than four items out of ten in which the teacher was at his best and similarly not more than four items which indicated his relative need for growth. This required that the principal really think about the qualities of his Pilot teacher rather than be governed by a feeling of good will and checking as "tops" every item. Or, if he were out of patience with his Pilot teacher, he might check all of the items as being satisfactory, which is the "halo" effect in reverse. The evaluation plan required that he distinguish between the strength and weakness of the Pilot teacher on an individual basis rather than by comparison with a hypothetical norm based upon his knowledge of many teachers. This type of evaluation had the merit of mutual agreement upon the areas needing improvement and making growth in these areas seem attainable to the Pilot teacher.

The college supervisor reminded the Pilot teacher and the principal either verbally or through the bulletin of the evaluation dates as they approached. Otherwise, this important process of each taking stock of the Pilot teacher's growth as a full-fledged teacher might be overlooked. In order to be sure that each understood the mechanics of using this type of an

evaluating sheet it was a practical precaution by the supervisor to see both evaluation sheets in October and possibly in January. The evaluation sheets were requested by the supervisor for his files by May.

The final visitation in late May or early June was an excellent time to consult quite fully with the principal in an oral appraisal of the Pilot teacher's growth during the year expressed in quite specific terms. Similarly, a common agreement on areas of greatest need for growth were sought. This information in turn was a basis for a final conference with the Pilot teacher in which some specific recommendations were made. This applied equally to the most competent of the Group as well as to the less able.

6. Role of the College Supervisor. In addition to the intricate relationships with school administrators required of the college supervisor once the Pilot student entered his internship, it developed that one of the contributing strengths to the Pilot Study's success in producing competent classroom teachers lay in the unbroken relationship of the college supervisor to the Pilot Study students in his group. This relationship started in the Fall semester of the student's junior year when he entered his first professional course, and continued through the entire range of professional experiences in the ensuing two years terminating with the completion of the student's internship year. In addition to the supervision of the students professional growth, all of the college supervisors found that in several crucial instances, by being of immediate help to students in personal crises, they also were able to save the student's professional life. Their accumulative knowledge of the student's abilities and potential, plus their own broad experience, and the fact that the entire resources of the School of Education from the Dean himself to all counseling services were at their disposal served to produce the high rate of students completing their work. The experience of these



college supervisors also points out that in the long run such uninterrupted supervision is most economical for everyone concerned.

All three college supervisors visited their students frequently and at various times of the day, in order to see all phases of the student's participation in the life of the school.

He saw facets of the Pilot teacher's activities before school, during the recess time, at lunch time, and after school, which are just as important to observe as those appearing in the more formal hours of the day. The cleverness with which one Pilot teacher gave the children in the cafeteria the right to chat joyously with each other without permitting the situation to degenerate into bedlam eloquently revealed his skill, even as a beginner, in working creatively with children. Although there were areas of teaching in which he was weak he could be assured on the basis of his skill in handling children in the cafeteria that he had an inherent ability for teaching which proved to be very true in a broad way before the school year closed. The informal periods also provided greater opportunity to confer with the Pilot teacher than during the more formal class work.

Similarly, the manner in which the children came into the classroom in the morning expresses their attitude toward the teacher and school in general. The expertness or the difficulty with which the teacher put the class to work following an exciting baseball game at noon were clues to teacher skill just as revealing as the way in which the class was organized into purposeful social studies committees.

Eating with the Pilot teacher in the cafeteria was also rewarding in supervision because her acceptance of fellow teachers and their acceptance of her can be readily observed. Sometimes eating alone with the student gave an excellent opportunity for a conference requiring some time to resolve a special problem without tension. Again, the cafeteria may be a good place for a three-way meeting of teacher, principal and supervisor.

The manner in which the boys and girls left their teacher at the close of the day told much about the human relations within that classroom and was indicative of the success of that school day.

It must not be implied that this emphasis upon the informal periods of visitation suggest any neglect whatever of a close observation of the language arts, social studies, arithmetic, science, music, or any other part of the general curriculum.



The college-supervisor must be readily accessible to the pilot teacher, a dependable standby when he needs assistance, but never to the point of pampering or undermining initiative and independence. His visits to the school must be sincerely welcomed. He must be diplomatic to the point of not causing any worry, yet he must be forthright and sometimes very firm. He must make it easy for the Pilot teachers to confer with him while at the schools so that he does not interfere with the ongoing instructional program. Usually before school, noons, recesses, and after school times are quite adequate for this. However, the Pilot teacher often requested a more deliberate conference at the supervisor's office where problems could be talked through thoroughly. Sometimes the supervisor made this request himself.

And the final area in which the college-supervisor served was in helping the student arrive at his own decision regarding where he wanted to teach upon the completion of the Pilot Study program, over and above the services of the College Placement Office.

7. Recommendations to the College. As a result of the experience with the three Pilot Study groups, the college-supervisors, the psychologist-counselor, and the social worker concurred in the following recommendations to the School of Education to serve as a guide in continuing with the internship aspect of the accelerated program:

1. In an accelerated program of this nature it is very important to select a college supervisor who is an effective teacher with extensive preparation and experience and who is a supervisor in the best sense of the word.
2. Continuity of relationship between the accelerated group and the College staff member should be retained through methods classes, student teaching, and internship.
3. Students should meet as a group during the year they are in school and some definite arrangements for conferences during both student teaching and the first year of teaching should be made.
4. More mature students should be drawn from the lower division of four-year institutions as well as from junior colleges.

5. A continuing recruitment program should be maintained in junior colleges, and junior college counselors should receive regularly an up-to-date fund of information concerning progress of accelerated program students.
6. The problem of selecting teachers with whom students are placed for their student-teaching should be studied carefully. Considering individual differences, it is probably better for some student-teachers to continue with the same supervising teacher through both periods of directed-teaching.
7. The problem of selecting teachers whom students will be with during their participating observation needs careful study.
8. Selection of accelerated program students should be made before the fourth semester (second half of sophomore year) except in those instances where the performance in the fourth semester is considered necessary information for making a final decision.
9. The question of whether the function of supervision is to upgrade teaching or to help the beginning teacher adjust to a situation, needs consideration and some decision.
10. Continued effort should be made for a closer relationship between the teacher education institutions and the local school districts.

## CHAPTER V

HOW DO PILOT STUDY STUDENTS COMPARE WITH OTHER  
COLLEGE OF THE PACIFIC STUDENTS?

1. Type of Study. The original planning for the Pilot Study in Elementary Education included a design that was experimental in nature. However, because evaluation as originally planned was not possible, the purpose of the Study shifted from an experimental comparison of the end product, - teaching excellence, - to action research which concentrated on a continuous effort to evaluate and reconstruct curriculum to improve the pre-service and in-service training of elementary school teachers. Actually, the lack of rigorous controls probably led to the acquisition of more important information than would have been gained in an experimental treatment.

After the Pilot Group I had been in school for a summer session, it became apparent that more information would be gained through shifting the pilot study curriculum where it seemed advisable, rather than maintaining a set pattern for the four years that the program would be in operation. By the time the Pilot Group II was well under way in the fall of 1956, it also became apparent that the instructor variable was so important it would not actually permit duplication of the experiences for the three groups. The difference in curriculum experiences by the three groups working with the three different instructors indicates both the flexibility of the program and the extent to which the instructors were involved as persons. It was fortunate in this Pilot Study that no attempt was made to stereotype the teaching or maintain a rigid schedule of classes for the three

different groups.

As a part of the evaluation, each of the supervisors wrote a report of the activities of his group with emphasis on information that might be of importance in evaluating the program.

2. Test Information About the Groups. Distributions and group means of achievement and scholastic ability scores will be presented later in the report for each of the three Pilot Study Groups. The Cooperative General Culture Test, hereafter referred to as the G. C. T., was used as an index of achievement level following the first two years of college work. The five parts of this test and the total of all the parts will be presented separately. Results for Pilot Study Groups I and II on the American Council on Education Psychological Examination, hereafter referred to as A.C.E., are given with the parts score, quantitative and linguistic, and the total of these two presented in three separate distributions. For the third pilot study group the School and College Ability Test, hereafter referred to as the S.C.A.T., was given because the College of the Pacific changed its testing program to include the S.C.A.T. rather than the A.C.E. for students entering as Juniors.

The scores\* for the Pilot Study students are presented as derived scores based on the norms developed with College of the Pacific students. These raw scores have all been converted to standard scores, multiplied by ten and then added algebraically to fifty. They are whole numbers representing tenths of a standard deviation from the mean of fifty, so that all the numbers used will be positive. In effect, this makes it possible to compare roughly the scores and means

---

\*See Appendix H for tables showing distribution of scores.



for groups with College of the Pacific students' performance. In making comparisons, however, several factors are important. Since A.C.E. scores for junior college students were reported in percentiles, these were transferred directly to standard scores by use of the normal probability tables. A.C.E. tests were administered at the beginning of the freshman year. The S.C.A.T. was administered at the beginning of the junior year to the Pilot Study students, and these scores were converted by using norms developed on other entering juniors during the years 1956 and 1957. The G.C.T. tests were required of all College of the Pacific students late in the fourth semester. Many of the pilot students came to the College of the Pacific to take the tests at that time. However, the Pilot Study group realized that these tests were being used for selection purposes and the effect of a somewhat higher motivation is probably reflected in the test scores.

The A.C.E. and the S.C.A.T. are both divided into quantitative and linguistic or verbal, and the two parts added for a total. However, there is a strong indication that the test scores are not comparable to any great extent at the extremes of the scale.

During the years 1956, 1957 and 1958, the Graduate Record Examination was required of all College of Pacific seniors late in the spring. This was a requirement for graduation after having been tried on a voluntary basis in 1955. The Area Tests consisting of three parts, Social Science, Humanities, and Natural Science, were administered in 1956 and 1958. The Aptitude Tests, consisting of Quantitative and Verbal parts, were administered in 1957. Distributions of the three pilot study groups taking these tests are given below in derived scores having a mean of fifty and a standard deviation of

ten, based on College of Pacific norms. Comparisons between each pilot study group and the appropriate group of seniors, not including pilot study students, and Education majors, not including pilot study students, were made on the basis of scores as they were returned from the Educational Testing Service. Differences between means of the Pilot Study Groups on the separate parts of the tests were compared with means of the seniors and Education majors using the "t" test of significance. The results of these tests appear in tables to follow.

Results. Test information derived from the F.R.E. lends assurance that insofar as the tests measure adequacy of Liberal Arts Education, the Pilot Study groups compare favorably with other seniors and other Education majors in this objective. As potential graduate students, the same general comparison can be made.

TABLE VIII

TOTALS AND MEANS OF DERIVED SCORES OF PILOT STUDY STUDENTS  
ON THE GENERAL CULTURE TESTS TAKEN AT THE END OF THE SOPHOMORE YEAR

| Pilot Study Group I             |       | N - 14 |
|---------------------------------|-------|--------|
|                                 | Total | Mean   |
| Social Studies                  | 794   | 56.71  |
| Literature                      | 774   | 55.29  |
| Science                         | 750   | 53.57  |
| Fine Arts                       | 747   | 53.36  |
| Mathematics                     | 703   | 50.21  |
| Total Score                     | 791   | 56.50  |
| Pilot Study Group II            |       | N - 17 |
|                                 | Total | Mean   |
| Social Studies                  | 1012  | 59.53  |
| Literature                      | 924   | 54.35  |
| Science                         | 870   | 51.18  |
| Fine Arts                       | 873   | 51.35  |
| Mathematics                     | 854   | 50.24  |
| Total Score                     | 935   | 55.00  |
| Pilot Study Group III           |       | N - 16 |
|                                 | Total | Mean   |
| Social Studies                  | 884   | 55.25  |
| Literature                      | 821   | 51.31  |
| Science                         | 812   | 50.75  |
| Fine Arts                       | 828   | 51.75  |
| Mathematics                     | 732   | 45.75  |
| Total Score                     | 826   | 51.62  |
| Pilot Study Groups I, II, & III |       | N - 47 |
|                                 | Total | Mean   |
| Social Studies                  | 2690  | 57.23  |
| Literature                      | 2519  | 53.60  |
| Science                         | 2432  | 51.74  |
| Fine Arts                       | 2448  | 52.08  |
| Mathematics                     | 2289  | 48.70  |
| Total Score                     | 2552  | 54.30  |

MEANS AND TOTALS OF DERIVED SCORES OF PILOT STUDY STUDENTS  
ON SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TESTS

American Council on Education Psychological Examination

Pilot Study Group I      N - 14

|              | Total | Mean   |
|--------------|-------|--------|
| Quantitative | 692   | 49.429 |
| Linguistic   | 788   | 56.286 |
| Total        | 778   | 55.571 |

Pilot Study Group II      N - 17

|              | Total | Mean   |
|--------------|-------|--------|
| Quantitative | 932   | 54.824 |
| Linguistic   | 927   | 54.529 |
| Total        | 938   | 55.176 |

School and College Ability Test

Pilot Study Group III      N - 15

|              | Total | Mean   |
|--------------|-------|--------|
| Quantitative | 783   | 52.200 |
| Linguistic   | 728   | 48.533 |
| Total        | 756   | 50.400 |

American Council on Education Psychological Examination

Total I & II      N - 31

|              | Total | Mean   |
|--------------|-------|--------|
| Quantitative | 1624  | 52.387 |
| Linguistic   | 1715  | 55.322 |
| Total        | 1716  | 55.355 |



TABLE X

64

COMPARISONS OF PILOT STUDY GROUPS WITH EDUCATION MAJORS AND COLLEGE OF  
THE PACIFIC SENIORS ON GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION TESTS

Pilot Study Group I, 1956 Area Tests

| Name of test    | Means for Education Majors | Difference between means | Means for Pilot Study Group | Differences between means | Means for Seniors |
|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Social Science  | 419.00                     | 38.86                    | 457.86                      | 35.45                     | 422.40            |
| Humanities      | 471.00                     | 53.29                    | 524.29                      | 63.98                     | 460.31            |
| Natural Science | 410.33                     | 48.23**                  | 458.57                      | 26.56                     | 432.02            |

Pilot Study Group III, 1958 Area Tests

|                 |        |       |        |       |        |
|-----------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|
| Social Science  | 415.78 | 33.45 | 449.23 | 7.26  | 441.91 |
| Humanities      | 476.41 | 18.21 | 494.62 | 15.45 | 479.16 |
| Natural Science | 417.97 | 44.34 | 462.31 | 21.08 | 441.23 |

Pilot Study Group II, 1957 Aptitude Test

|              |        |       |        |       |        |
|--------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|
| Quantitative | 396.34 | 4.99  | 401.33 | 19.38 | 420.71 |
| Verbal       | 417.32 | 14.02 | 431.33 | 3.95  | 427.38 |

---

\*\* "t" significant at the 5% level

The hypothesis that no difference exists was rejected only once. Lack of significant differences in the other comparisons of means cannot be said to show equality of means, however.

TABLE XI

65

TOTALS AND MEANS OF DERIVED SCORES OF PILOT STUDY STUDENTS  
ON THE GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION TESTS TAKEN PRIOR TO GRADUATION

## Graduate Record Examination (Area)

## Pilot Study Group I      N - 14

|                 | Total | Mean   |
|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Social Science  | 732   | 52.286 |
| Humanities      | 767   | 54.786 |
| Natural Science | 719   | 51.357 |

## Pilot Study Group III      N - 13

|                 | Total | Mean   |
|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Social Science  | 651   | 50.077 |
| Humanities      | 668   | 51.385 |
| Natural Science | 670   | 51.538 |

## Graduate Record Examination (Aptitude)

## Pilot Study Group II      N - 17

|              | Total | Mean   |
|--------------|-------|--------|
| Quantitative | 829   | 48.765 |
| Verbal       | 865   | 50.882 |

## Graduate Record Examination Totals (Area)

## Pilot Study Groups I &amp; III      N - 27

|                 | Total | Mean   |
|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Social Science  | 1383  | 51.222 |
| Humanities      | 1435  | 53.148 |
| Natural Science | 1389  | 51.444 |

## CHAPTER VI

## STUDENT SUPERVISOR AND FACULTY EVALUATION

A meeting of Pilot Study students, School of Education faculty members involved in the program, and members of the Advisory Group was called for the evening of December 10, 1957, for the purposes of evaluating the Pilot Study and making recommendations for changes or additions as it became a regular program offered by the School of Education. The students, supervisors, and faculty members were divided into small groups for discussion. Criticisms and evaluative statements were recorded. The content of these is presented below in the first paragraph following each heading.

College Supervisor

The college supervisor was characterized as someone you know very well, someone who knows you as a person, and to whom you may turn for help. There was a great deal of encouragement as well as help from the college supervisor during the time that it was needed. The college supervisor knows how the person reacts and the way the school situation looks to the person better than a supervisor for the school district possibly could, especially at the beginning of the year.

The emphasis here seemed to be on the ability of a student and a college supervisor to communicate with each other readily in a common terminology with a feeling of mutual acceptance. This was rather generally accepted as a real strength because relationships between the supervisor and beginning teacher were already established when the teacher needed help. Probably having the same supervisor for student teaching is important in this program.

### Internship Program

The relationship with the college supervisor set the mood and attitude for future dealings and relationships with consultants in the public school system. The internship program helped the beginning teacher get used to having other people come in and observe classes. It fostered good attitudes toward on-the-job supervision and an open-mindedness toward suggestions. It helped them overcome critical situations and developed in them the wholesome attitude toward in-service help available in the school system. Pilot program people felt free to call on regular consultants in the public schools. Supervision from the college prepared beginning teachers for regular school consultants and fostered open-mindedness toward suggestions from other people in the profession. Evaluation of the internship aspect of the program brought up the ideas that (1) supervision during the first year should be given all new teachers; (2) more supervision should be supplied at the beginning of the first year of teaching and should be continued for the first year. Also some thought that internship for only the first semester would be adequate.

The internship part of the program was unanimously considered very important, not only as an immediate help in getting started as a teacher, but also with respect to making it easier to take advantage of suggestions and ideas from other professional persons, readily to ask for help from supervisors provided by public school systems.

### Group Experiences

Belonging to a group was very important. All the persons in the group were preparing for the same thing, and there was a feeling that all



were on the way up. There was a sense of belonging to a group that was a great help during the first year of teaching. Some students felt that the close companionship with the group for two years was rewarding and compensated for any lack of so-called college life.

The group spirit that developed because students studying together were able to meet rather continuously for two years, comparing observations and working out problems to their first year of teaching, seemed to have helped a great deal, not only in providing a place for releasing tensions and recognizing that other people have had similar problems, but also in exchanging both information and attitudes relative to the problems of teaching.

#### Financial Support

There seems to be an appreciable number of prospective teachers in the fourteenth grade (junior college) who need financial assistance. After two years in junior college this group should continue with its schooling because it is important to retain the prospective teachers at this particular time in their college preparation. The financial aspect of the pilot study was considered very important in getting new teachers, because borrowing money to go to summer school is sometimes very difficult. Also it was a relief to be able to get through school without having to take another job, and to be allowed to stay in school without any interruption to earn money for continuing an education. Some of the Pilot Study students stated they would not have been teachers if it had not been for the Pilot Study program, while others said they would have gone on to become teachers anyway.

Those students who would have become teachers anyway would have been delayed one or more years in getting on the job because of the

necessity to work to earn money. Financial assistance seems to have been important in helping recruit teachers.

### Observation

It was considered that more participation in the classroom would be helpful and there should be more guided classroom observation. It was suggested that, if students could spend enough time in observation, the methods course would have added meaning for the students. It would be valuable to have guided observation running concurrently with methods courses, and these should be with a larger number of teachers, and in a larger span of grade levels.

The inclusion of observation experience early in the program was recognized as being very helpful. This is emphasized by the realization that they could have been even more important if they had been more extensive and varied.

### Student Teaching.

One semester of student teaching is not enough in itself to help teachers get started in the first year. It would be desirable to get student-teachers in a classroom during the beginning of a school year. Close supervision was very important during the student-teaching period. Some teachers are not as effective as they should be as supervising teachers in order to give students a good student-teacher experience.

The importance of student-teaching seems to have been emphasized by the internship experience in arousing a realization of what a good student teaching experience can do in professional preparation. This is also indicated by criticism of weaknesses in student teaching offerings.

### Internship Course Work

Administrators felt that a three unit load of college work each semester imposed a heavy load upon Pilot Study teachers during their internship and would recommend reducing it. It was sometimes necessary to miss professional obligations at the school because the Pilot program people met and attended a college course during the evening once every two weeks. The night classes during the first year brought the group together and relieved some job insecurities through sharing problems. The course, Child Growth and Development was offered too late in the plan, that is, during the internship year, and should be given before student teaching. The opinion was generally expressed that students in the Pilot program should not attempt more than half-time work at any time for self-support.

Although there are good reasons for continuation or elimination of the three unit load during the internship year, the difference of opinion was not resolved at this evaluation meeting.

### Other Remarks

1. Administrators who had been associated with the program in its various stages have found it most satisfactory as to its operations and the teacher product. Pilot teachers have status and are considered as good, if not better, than those following the regular program. Pilot Study teachers are ahead of the average teachers when they enter the field.
2. It was believed that the principal of the school should exercise care to assign special duties or overloads with consideration of the first year teaching.

3. There was too much attention from the principal in some cases and this worked as a detriment to the teachers.
4. In some cases the principal did not give enough help and attention to the beginning teachers.
5. Teachers already in a school system may resent the fact that a new teacher calls in consultants freely.
6. Screening of candidates and selection for the program was very well done, and should be done as carefully in screening all candidates for teaching.
7. Talking with the people in the Pilot Study program helped in setting goals, such as that of becoming a teacher. The orientation and guidance aspects were very important characteristics of the program.
8. The people selected as college supervisors were excellently suited for their job.
9. The financial aspect of the Pilot Study was really very important in getting new teachers.
10. It seemed an advantage that the program was designed for undergraduate.
11. The Pilot program seemed to attract more mature students, people who were more sound in their judgements.
12. The summer session helped students become oriented to the regular years at the College of the Pacific.
13. The first group had little college life. The second and third groups had opportunities for campus activities. The third group participated more in campus life, such as joining fraternities, but was not as close as were groups one and two.



14. Some students in the program minded the fact that upper division in regard to normal college life was seriously restricted, but some students felt that they had greatly enjoyed college life during their first two years in junior college and it was time as a junior to get down to the serious business of professional preparation.
15. The Pilot Study program was invaluable as a stepping-stone to secondary school experiences.
16. It was suggested that a three-way evaluation, including principal, teacher, and college supervisor, was very important, especially during the first semester.

## CHAPTER VII

## FINAL CONCLUSIONS

1. The Pilot Study placed 47 teachers in California schools and followed them all through to a successful conclusion of their beginning year.
2. Recruitment was very successful as indicated by the large number of applicants inquiring during the second and third years, and by the interest shown and important help given by the junior college counselors. One reason for acceptance by counselors was that they saw this program as a new vocational possibility for some of their counselees who otherwise would be unable to pursue higher education. The program was proposed to the junior college counselors with no attempt at salesmanship. The counselors readily involved themselves in the selection of candidates, and were doing a fairly extensive amount of pre-screening by the time the third group was selected.
3. Pilot Study teachers demonstrated that they could start successfully to teach one year earlier than on an unaccelerated program. This represents a sizable addition of teaching resources. Under most favorable conditions it would be conservative to estimate that ninety additional years of teaching in California schools resulted directly from the unique characteristics of the PilotStudy program.
4. Evaluation of the Pilot Study program shows it to be very effective in preparing teachers, and invaluable in seeing them through the first year of teaching. Strength of the program is shown in the fact that every teacher who began the internship year finished as

a successful teacher at the end of the first year, although there were cases in each of the three groups where beginning teachers would, in all likelihood, have had unsuccessful experiences if college supervision had not been provided and probably would have terminated their teaching career, either during the first year or at its conclusion.

5. Administrators readily accepted Pilot Study teachers for employment. The reaction of administrators to Pilot Study students in other ways was very favorable and indicated that the level of preparation was very satisfactory.
6. The quality of liberal arts education received by the Pilot Study students, as indicated by the Graduate Record Examination tests, was shown to be equal to that of regular education majors.
7. Internship supervision has proved a very important feature of the Pilot Study program.
8. Supervisor continuity throughout the methods course, student teaching, and internship is responsible to an appreciable degree for the effectiveness of internship supervision.
9. The group situation developed in the program is a major component of the program's strength.

#### Final Questions Raised for Further Study:

1. What should be the mutual relationship of the teacher education institution and employing school districts in relation to the beginning teacher's first year on the job?
2. Whose responsibility is it to help the new teacher through the crucial first year on the job? This raises the question of reasons for

so many drop-outs and subsequent loss to the teaching profession.

3. What makes a "good" teacher, and how can these qualities be evaluated in selecting candidates at the beginning of their teacher education period?

###



## APPENDIX A

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON SELECTION CRITERIA  
AS RELATED TO JOB PERFORMANCE

George Ingebo

Criteria for the selection of individuals who show promise of being able to learn and later practice professional skills must be consistent with what the student is going to be called upon to do in both learning and subsequent practice. It is especially important when indirect measures for selection are to be chosen or devised, that complete and accurate knowledge of tasks to be performed be made available for deciding on an appropriate combination of criteria. The difficulty of formulating a universally accepted statement of what superior teaching is, or of developing an evaluative criteria for teacher excellence, is attested to by the long history of failure in attempts to develop any satisfactory way of measuring teachers and teaching excellence for the purpose of merit rating.

The variety of school systems that exists within any large city district or county with respect to their common responsibility, namely that of teaching, makes it almost impossible to give a general job description of teaching that fits all classrooms and administrative philosophies. To some extent it is similarly difficult to foresee educational experiences that will be provided for a student by various schools of education within our institutions preparing teachers. Although selection of students for the Pilot Study program had been studied for five years as pertaining to a fairly well described program, the problem of placement after the student has left the institution is similar to that encountered in other California school systems.

1. Ability to cope with a variety of situations is important in a long term as well as in an immediate sense. As the student leaves college he will be going into a job situation that will almost certainly be new to him in some respects and in some cases actually quite different from what he had been taught to expect. Under present conditions of teacher placement and hiring practices it is unlikely that the kind of job a teacher will be asked to do can be predicted or decided on the basis of what he can do best. The administrative philosophy and the school policies will certainly have a wide-spread effect on the beginning teacher.

In extreme cases a beginning teacher who has tried very hard to perfect, as far as possible, as way of teaching may be teaching under a conscientious building principal with quite a different philosophy of education, who will try to guide the beginning teacher into a quite different way of teaching from that acquired in the college preparation. Often more experienced teachers will also try to influence them and sometimes be quite disparaging of the methods taught in colleges. Since a good teacher is personally rather deeply involved in his professional practice, it is very difficult, in a period as full of stress as that in beginning the first year of school, to take on a new way of teaching, and still retain what is important to him in the previously learned concepts of education.

Also, it is not uncommon for a beginning teacher to be almost swamped by the complexity of managing and teaching a room full of youngsters for the first time. When the pressures become too great for the individual to cope with, a sort of panic is likely to cause the beginning teacher to revert to ways of teaching that were learned as a pupil during his own elementary experiences. Because of the overpowering newness of the teaching situation the beginning teacher will frequently mistrust the principles and methods learned in a relatively short period of professional training, and continue to practice those earlier techniques which are seen as successful.

At the time the Pilot Study was formulated, the internship program was considered a powerful safeguard against first year failure on the part of new teachers. It was demonstrated to be probably most useful in the help and support supervisors were able to give at a time when the beginning teacher, faced with full responsibility for a very complex situation, would not have developed real skill in applying techniques and methods learned if left to face the situation alone. Individual differences were noted in the ability of students to swing with the pressures of a situation and still maintain their value systems and concepts with respect to teaching. Because of the impossibility of predicting into which of the wide variety of situations students would go in our public school systems the ability to cope with a variety of situations was seen as very important for beginning teachers.

2. A sense of responsibility was also important because of the nature of teaching. A teacher works in a school community where she is responsible for actions that coincide or are articulated with those of other people. Teaching in a school system also involves a large number of activities that cannot be legislated or encompassed by school policies. Self-discipline and respect for other individuals involved can actually facilitate the teacher's instruction by prompt and careful attention to the many details commonly found under the heading of "reports" or "record keeping." When various features of the job, such as meeting classes on time or prompt collection and disbursement of lunch money are sources of irritation or waste of time and strain staff-relationships when they are postponed, they might add to the many pressures already present in beginning teaching.

3. Maturity seems to be a sort of base from which to start the learning process in both the period of preparation and the early experiences of the beginning teacher. It can be considered a reflection of the depth as well as number and extent of experiences common to our culture the individual has actually lived. The more mature individual probably understands more of the related aspects of the situation and better evaluates the mental "trials" in trial-and-error consideration of a problem. Without loss of spontaneity, there seems to be better control of both physiological and psychological motivational tensions. In one way chronological age is an index of the opportunity a person has had to develop maturity, and

since the Pilot Study program placed the teacher on the job one year earlier this index had some special significance for the Pilot Study program. Because the School of Education staff had the problem of developing in the students sensitivities to and capacities for judgment of important social situations, a higher maturity level could be thought of as giving them more with which to work.

4. Creativity is important in terms of individual willingness to produce something new and take the responsibility for judging its value. In this sense a creative act is considered something that is evaluated and accepted as complete by the individual creating it, rather than by conditions and functions existing in the external environment. Learning situations are often created by a teacher who can make use of a possible teaching opportunity that has unexpectedly presented itself. Creativity is often expressed in a rather carefully worked out plan of action requiring a great deal of skill and understanding on the part of the teacher. Ingenuity is included but exceeded in that unusual features are easily and appropriately included. Expected results are heightened motivation in pupils and greater professional satisfaction for the teacher.

5. Academic records as presented on the student's transcript are important predictors of the ability to make a similar record in the last two years of college. Since it is necessary to maintain a certain level in subjects other than those taught in the School of Education a good academic record is quite desirable. Probably as important is information about how the individual worked to achieve whatever academic success he has had. In case of very high records, the fact that professional preparation is often quite different from other course work makes it important to find out how appropriate techniques and attitudes with respect to grades are for developing depth of understanding and use of abstract concepts in guiding behavior. Low grades are danger signals. Assurance that general education background is sufficient in spite of a poor record is necessary. More difficult is the equally important determination of causative factors depressing the achievement as expressed in school marks and estimation of how completely they can be removed in the new situation. When success in this area has not been demonstrated, there is little information about the probability of getting satisfactory grades even when previous barriers seem to be adequately removed.

6. Motivation should be considered with respect to intensity and consistency as well as the goal to be achieved. Here the Pilot Study differed with respect to the necessary requirements from that of the regular education program in that the schedule required continuous attendance through the two summers. Also the small number of students included in the groups made it important that there be evidence of sufficient motivation for the individual to complete the program.



7. Scholastic ability includes what is commonly thought of as intelligence. Since the correlation between scholastic ability and scholastic achievement is commonly found to be less than would warrant substituting one for the other these two important criteria are considered separately. Scores on scholastic ability tests or intelligence tests that are half a standard deviation or more below the college average on local norms, if available, indicate a need for further investigation of this characteristic. This is, of course, an arbitrary indicator and should be considered a guide line for selection information gaining procedures rather than a cutting score. Importance of scholastic ability is partially explained by the idea that high intellectual functioning is a sort of insurance against inordinately difficult conditions that the student and beginning teacher might experience. With a very difficult placement due to such things as a large number of students, lack of ready supervision, and a heavy load of activities outside the classroom, a new teacher will have to learn very rapidly and be able to muster all of the resources available to give him help if he is going to have a successful teaching experience.

8. Experience in relating to children is not only helpful as a groundwork for learning about them, but it is also one of the positive factors helping the person make a decision as to whether or not the teaching profession is likely to be a satisfactory vocational choice. From the standpoint of vocational guidance with respect to consideration of teaching, the counselor has a definite advantage if the counselee has had an appreciable amount of experience with school age children. It is important to follow the common statement "I like children," rather carefully to find out "How?" A sincere desire to teach children is a very strong recommendation.

9. Time is required to understand properly the concepts that are being taught in the professional preparation. This factor was tested in the Pilot Study program and probably the recommendation from the student group, that a half-time job is the maximum out-of-school commitment of time that can be spent without neglecting preparation, is defensible. This criterion is equally important in the determination of financial suitability for the program.

10. Health might be even more important than is usually considered for teaching. In any case, the continual and often severe demands on a teacher can be only poorly met if physical reserve is not present.

#### CRITERIA SUGGESTED FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. Work level, thought of as a learned characteristic, as well as capacity might be an important and usable criterion. Some individuals of college age have learned to expend effort effectually in working continuously over protracted periods of time and can be said to have learned how to work.



2. Awareness of basic needs as they fit into the motivational patterns of people can be thought of as something probably having been learned through some degree of deprivation, where needs such as food, clothing, shelter, or physical safety have not been properly met.

3. Professional thinking, probably the most defensible distinction separating "professional" as a vocational classification, is the requirement that judgement be depended on in making decisions of a socially important nature in the absence of specific determiners of formulae.

4. Acceptance of guidance on the part of an applicant might be a good indication of how he will make use of supervision during his professional training, in practice teaching, and on the job.

## APPENDIX B

COMMENTS ON SOURCES OF INFORMATION  
RELATING TO SELECTION

George Ingebo

Accepting applicants to be prepared for the teaching profession can be thought of as getting relevant information, complete and reliable enough to indicate an acceptable probability that the student will benefit sufficiently from college experiences to perform successfully in the classroom. Relationships between these conditions and "information" are indicated below:

1. Relevancy in this case includes the concept that validity is specific for the individual characteristics as expressed in the criterion, and recognizes that in gaining information for selection proposes the person or persons making the final decision have appreciable opportunity to vary the direction of their search for information after the process has gotten under way.
2. Completeness can mean consistent checking of inconsistent indicators, or additional information other than that routinely collected when decisions seem to be borderline. The emphasis of selection on not erring in the direction of rejection or not including someone who will fail will be reflected in kind and amount of inclusions.
3. Reliability of information means its consistency due to both the individual getting it and to the technique used.
4. Acceptable probability indicates that the selection process will not be expected to operate without error. In fact, the variety of situations in which a beginning teacher might be placed almost guarantees error in either direction. Level as well as accuracy of prediction are important in terms of time and facilities used in selection.
5. Benefiting from preparation includes staying in school and being receptive to professional courses as they exist in whatever curriculum is followed. A thorough knowledge of the experiences a student can be expected to have is necessary for close prediction.
6. Successful classroom performance for all students accepted is the ultimate hope of those responsible for selection. (1) "What is accepted as successful?" and (2) "Which classroom?" are questions answered with far too little certainty for selection to be effective within narrow limits.

## SOURCES

Locating applicants is facilitated by supplying counselors with extensive information about the program while cooperating with the school administration in their methods of making students aware of the existence and possibilities of the program. The importance of knowing the situation students go into is obvious. Knowing the experiences he has had before entering the preparation program can also be of major importance.

One of the effective economies of selection procedure is becoming familiar with the guidance resources of the schools in which the student's first two years of college were spent. Acquaintance with the institution from which an applicant comes will allow a selector to construct his preferred check list of basic information and sources so as to save time in both the initial and final stages of selection. Cumulative records are important in all cases. When members of the guidance staff are willing to go over the applicant's folder with the person seeking information its value can be increased extensively in most cases by adding to, explaining, describing, modifying, and combining bits of information as well as suggesting other sources pertinent to interpreting information.

Another important resource is the testing facilities of the guidance section. If the orientation tests are not complete or if it is inconvenient to have the applicant come in for testing, it is usually possible to get tests administered at that institution.

### Cumulative Records

1. Application for admittance to the institution includes identifying information with usual recommendations from teachers or advisors. Records should reveal strong and weak points with respect to academic endeavors and information concerning extra-curricular activities such as belonging to clubs, participating in sports, dramatics, music, and other special interests, while in high school. Some indication of any adjustment to campus life is frequently included. Schools will differ in material gathered for admission purposes.
2. Orientation information may include somewhat extensive test results. When the orientation is carried throughout the first semester in a required class considerable vocational information and vocational aspiration of the individual will appear. This may include an assignment in the nature of vocational investigation and a student prepared paper discussing his or her vocational and educational goals. Names of counselors or advisors responsible for students will be stated.

3. Registrars' records or transcripts of school marks usually include high school records also. The official transcript of grades will give a pattern of courses as well as grades and will serve as the main source of information concerning the individual's ability to get school marks in various subjects. Frequently test scores from high school are also included. This is a source of information with which to compare various other indicators of special or general ability. Change of course slips frequently show reason for the change which might be important. Notices of low class performance are usually found in the cumulative record. Applications of various kinds, such as excuses from taking courses, permission to work, or letters of recommendation from employers may prove helpful.
4. Guidance records from the guidance or counseling office may be important with respect to various problems the student has encountered with classes or teachers. Personal adjustments and how successfully they were met by the student may be indicated. Frequently notices of low achievement during the class and the reasons for it will be given on standard forms. Notes of educational and vocational planning with the advisor may also be included.
5. Attendance notices indicating excessive absences from teachers or the attendance office may indicate a necessity to follow up the attendance office records to investigate the extent and pattern of absences as well as the reasons for them.
6. Health records may point to health difficulties needing to be considered.
7. Work experience reports from the instructor and the employer will be available in the folder if the student has taken work experience units.
8. Co-curricular activities and awards, honors, or offices held in campus organizations will probably be listed.

#### Interview

The interview technique is important both in giving and obtaining information. A fairly satisfactory and economical use of energy and time seems to be evidenced in using an initial interview to make sure the individual has accurate information concerning the program he is applying for, and to communicate to him the importance of making a careful decision as to whether the program suits him and he suits the program. Varying amounts of information can be gained during this interview, some of which will be checked against the cumulative record. Provided that the applicant is still interested in the program, a second interview can be used for information to explain or to fill in gaps after the cumulative records have been studied. Some areas where important information can be sought are listed below.



1. Work History. A chronological history of work experiences with dates to the nearest month is usually sufficient. Pertinent things to look for about each job with respect to the criteria listed above are as follows:

- a. How the job was obtained
- b. Reasons for seeking and taking the job
- c. Length of time the job was held and the pattern and amount of time spent per week
- d. Way in which job was terminated
- e. Skills and responsibilities involved in carrying on the job
- f. Improvement in efficiency of accomplishing the job
- g. Relationships and their extent with other employees, or employers and testimonies, if any
- h. Aspects of the job most liked and most disliked
- i. Instances of stress situations, if any, and how these were met
- j. What, if anything, was learned from the overall job experience

2. Community Life. Organizations belonged to or activities of a social nature engaged in.

- a. Reasons for becoming interested
- b. Aspects that were liked or disliked
- c. Extent of work with other people
- d. Evidences of responsibility or leadership
- e. Estimate of time spent
- f. Characteristics, such as work habits or social skills, liked or disliked in people who were worked with

3. Experiences with Children. An expressed desire to work with children requires some indication of how and in what way.

- a. Age range of children worked with
- b. Nature of activities engaged in with children
- c. Satisfying or challenging features of working with children
- d. Characterization of children found enjoyable to work with and those found unpleasant to work with.

- e. Methods of controlling children and their effectiveness
  - f. How perceived and thought of by the children worked with
4. Impression of Teaching. The present view of teaching as fitting into the student's future life.
- a. Satisfactions anticipated from doing a good job of teaching
  - b. Adequacy of financial rewards
  - c. Time required outside classroom - interesting or just routine
  - d. Summer activities as viewed from the standpoint of professional improvement
  - e. Things to be respected by children, parents and community
  - f. Plans for possible specialization after a few years of teaching experience
5. Impressions gained from relatives or friends who are teachers. The influence of people active in the profession may have an important effect on the accuracy of information applicants have about teaching or the motivation to become a teacher.
- a. Attractive features stated or demonstrated.
  - b. Hardships or dissatisfactions with teacher stated or demonstrated
  - c. Encouragement or discouragement received toward teaching
  - d. Ways to be successful in teaching
6. Emphasizing Situations. Important successes or failures, emergencies, or unusual demands on the applicant's energy and stamina.
- a. View taken of a situation
  - b. Way in which the situations were met
  - c. Results in terms of change or modifications of opinions or attitudes involved
  - d. Resulting likes or dislikes for other individuals involved
7. Ideas and impressions recalled from elementary and secondary school experiences to the extent that they are fairly vivid.
- a. Preferences in subjects
  - b. Preferences in ways material was taught

- c. Perception of the school work as related to life situations
- d. Outstanding teachers and their impact on the applicant
- e. Use of time in school
- f. Use of educational resources
- g. Residual ideas from courses such as General Psychology and Introduction to Education
- h. Courses they remembered as having learned the most in, with reasons why

8. Health Conditions.

- a. Physical handicaps and extent of compensation
- b. Recurring health difficulties and the extent to which they incapacitate the individual
- c. Reserve of physical energy

9. Media for Self-Expression.

- a. Artistic talent, drama, music, dancing, literary composition, painting, and others
- b. Hobbies or sports
- c. Organizing or leadership ability
- d. Available time and opportunity

## APPENDIX C

## SUGGESTED PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES

Education 134 - Newton

## I. Room Environment

1. Arranging bulletin boards
2. Arranging science exhibits and collections
3. Arranging furniture
4. Mounting pictures
5. Filing materials
6. Cataloging books and materials

I.

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_

## II. Instructional Program

1. Preparing seat work (related to classes observed)
2. Mixing easel paints, finger paints, etc.
3. Helping with art materials (as in using chalk on wet paper, protecting desks from clay, etc.)
4. Making charts
5. Typing materials for children's books
6. Collecting materials (booklets, etc.)
7. Arranging for speakers
8. Making arrangements for study trips
9. Assisting on study trips
10. Showing films, filmstrips, etc.
11. Playing piano, operating phonograph, etc.
12. Making card file or Social Studies references
13. Finding materials in library
14. Making musical instruments
15. Enlarging maps
16. Telling stories
17. Reading stories and assisting with dramatization

II.

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_
8. \_\_\_\_\_
9. \_\_\_\_\_
10. \_\_\_\_\_
11. \_\_\_\_\_
12. \_\_\_\_\_
13. \_\_\_\_\_
14. \_\_\_\_\_
15. \_\_\_\_\_
16. \_\_\_\_\_
17. \_\_\_\_\_

## III. Helping Children

1. Aiding a child who has been absent
2. Assisting at games or folk dancing
3. Helping children find material in library
4. Assisting with difficult construction (as a puppet stage)
5. Assisting with parties

III.

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_

## IV. Helping in Classroom Control

1. Sitting with or helping a child who has been isolated
2. Observing child's reactions and responses under specific conditions
3. Keeping anecdotal records

IV.

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_

## V. Classroom Routine

1. Checking attendance
2. Keeping lunch and milk accounts
3. Filing excuses, requests, etc.
4. Seeing that visitors sign register

V.

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_

## VI. Specific Skills to be Perfected during this Period

1. Manuscript and Cursive writing (on board and paper)
2. Cutting letters
3. Enlarging maps
4. Story Telling
5. Oral reading

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_



## APPENDIX D

88

## Sample of Informal Questionnaire

|                                                                                                                           | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Uncertain.</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|
| 1. Was the 197 course of last semester easier than the present 198?                                                       | 0          | 13        | 1                 |
| 2. Did it pay to do the auditing and followup work in Human Relations?                                                    | 14         | 0         | 0                 |
| 3. Would you omit the Hymes books of required reading?                                                                    | 0          | 14        | 0                 |
| 4. Would you favor reading all the Wiles book for required reading?                                                       | 4          | 7         | 3                 |
| 5. Do you favor including Taba's booklet on the sociogram and other child study techniques?                               | 13         | 0         | 1                 |
| 6. Do you favor the college supervisor visiting you at various times of the day?                                          | 13         | 1         | 0                 |
| 7. Do you favor the including of the Shaftel pamphlet on role playing in the list of required reading?                    | 12         | 1         | 1                 |
| 8. Did the counseling of the college supervisor conflict with that of the principal?                                      | 3          | 10        | 1                 |
| 9. Was the college supervisor too strict in dealing with the group?                                                       | 0          | 13        | 1                 |
| 10. Did you feel that you were favored this first year in your total required duties over other teachers in the building? | 3          | 9         | 2                 |
| 11. Did you receive much help from the city or county supervisors?                                                        | 3          | 10        | 1                 |
| 12. Did you find the other teachers of the building friendly toward the Pilot program?                                    | 12         | 0         | 2                 |
| 13. Would you like the college supervisor to give more specific answers to your problems?                                 | 7          | 6         | 1                 |
| 14. Would you suggest more committee buzz sessions at the Thursday evening meetings?                                      | 9          | 4         | 1                 |
| 15. Do you regret having entered the Pilot Study?                                                                         | 1          | 13        | 0                 |
| 16. Do you prefer written quizzes over oral quizzes?                                                                      | 5          | 8         | 1                 |
| 17. Are the information bulletins sent out by the college adviser helpful to you?                                         | 12         | 2         | 0                 |
| 18. Have you enjoyed the companionship of the Pilot group                                                                 | 14         | 0         | 0                 |
| 19. Would you omit the book, "These are Your Children"?                                                                   | 1          | 13        | 0                 |
| 20. Would you favor more sharing of each others classroom experience?                                                     | 12         | 1         | 1                 |

COLLEGE OF THE PACIFIC  
Education 197

Class Bulletin - December 12, 1955

Roy E. Learned, Instructor

CLASS SESSION PLANS

The following is a brief summary of the conclusions which we reached in the planning period of our meeting for better utilization of the two-hour class sessions on alternate Thursday evenings beginning with our next class meeting:

1. 7:00 - 7:30 - A discussion of the key points in the basic text assignment, as the class sees them, under the voluntary leadership of one of the class members. This will serve as a quick review and orientation for the written test.
2. 7:30 - 8:00 - A written test covering the reading assignment in the basic text.
3. 8:00 - 8:30 - The division of the class into committees, based on interests, each to discuss and prepare an oral report on some pertinent problem relating to the classroom. This will give an opportunity to share with classmates important experiences in the field. At the conclusion of the discussion session a leader and a recorder as well as the topic will be chosen by each committee for the next meeting. Later a rotation of leaders for several meetings may be agreed upon.
4. 8:30 - 9:00 - Oral reports covering the discussion of the two committees.

VALUE OF THE DISCUSSIONS

This discussion approach during our scheduled class meetings gives promise of providing unexcelled opportunities for professional growth such as:

1. Realistic experience in working with a committee of teachers on a common problem which resembles very closely carrying out an assignment from the principal with a group of fellow staff members.
2. Actual experience in adult leadership resembling closely the leadership of a teacher committee or community group.
3. Sharing practical ideas and inspirations for vitalizing the classroom instruction of children on level beyond classroom observation, the methods course in college and student teaching.
4. Making the assigned reading of the course as well as voluntary reading in current professional periodicals actual sources of information for solving current problems in the classroom.

JANUARY EVALUATION OF PILOT TEACHING

The time for the second cooperative evaluation with your principal of your Pilot teaching is near at hand. I will want to study the results in January on my round of visitation. This evaluation is useful as a basis for teacher-principal-adviser conferences, and is not related to the official evaluation by the principal as required by the superintendent.

APPENDIX F

90

COLLEGE OF THE PACIFIC  
Stockton 4, California

School of Education

August 31, 1955

Your special attention is invited to the attached report which describes the second year program of the College of the Pacific Pilot Group Number I. The report is the outgrowth of agreements reached at meetings held in the three major areas where the Pilot Group will teach this year. Those who participated in these meetings were the following:

Stockton Unified School District

William McClintock  
Clifton Adcock  
Iva B. Capps

San Joaquin County Schools

Bernadine Wierson  
Pearl Harrison  
Robert Leighton  
James Linn  
Vera Garner  
August Auch

Modesto City Schools

Thomas Chapman  
Lovelie Downing  
Alma Kidd  
Gladys Francis  
Marjorie Frye

Copies of this report are being sent to all administrators, principals, coordinators, and teachers concerned with the project this year.

Very sincerely,

Roy E. Learned  
Director of Elementary Education

REL:alj  
Enc.



## COLLEGE OF THE PACIFIC

August 31, 1955

THE SECOND YEAR PROGRAM OF PILOT GROUP NUMBER IGeneral Information

All fourteen members of the first Pilot group of the experimental study in teacher education which was launched at the College of the Pacific in June, 1954 have been employed as teachers in the elementary schools of Stockton, Modesto, Lodi or in the San Joaquin County Schools for the coming year. Although they will teach on a provisional credential, they will lack only a few units of being eligible for their degree and a general elementary credential. This is the result of an accelerated program of study covering two full summer sessions, 1954 and 1955, and both semesters of the school year 1954-55.

In addition to the acceleration feature just mentioned, two other important characteristics were conceived by Dean J. Marc Jantzen and the Pilot Study Advisory Committee during the initial planning of the project in the Spring of 1954. The first was to change the normal sequence of the basic professional courses which the regular credential candidates follow in their Junior year. Instead of starting in the Fall with the combined six-unit course in Child Growth and Development and Principles of Elementary Education and following in the Spring with the Methods Block Course, the Pilot group began in the Fall with Methods and followed in the Spring with student teaching.

The second major change, which also involves sequence, is the provision for supervision while on the job as paid teachers during the first year. Such supervision will be by an instructor in the School of Education of the college. Concurrently during this first year of teaching, the Pilot teachers will take on campus with their supervising instructor the block course in child Growth and Principles of Elementary Education which they omitted during the preceding Fall. Three units of credit will be given each semester for this on-the-job course which will complete their requirements for the degree and the teaching credential. Thus, within two years after graduating from Junior College, they will have received their degree and credential at the same time as those following the regular program of teacher training will receive theirs. But, in addition, the Pilot group will have earned one whole year of salary as classroom teachers.

It will be of interest to know that our two outside consultants in the Pilot program, Dr. Lucien Kinney, Professor of Teacher Education at Stanford University, and Dr. Merle Elliot, Director of Research of the Oakland Schools, express the conviction that the follow-up plan for the first year of teaching is one of the outstanding features of the Pilot Study Program.

When it became apparent that this follow-up phase of the Pilot Study was approaching, meetings were held to discuss the implications involved for all concerned. The principals of the schools where the Pilot members will teach this fall and others in administrative and consulting positions likely to be involved in the program met in early summer in Lodi, Stockton and Modesto, and with the college representative. The information which follows was tentatively agreed upon at these meetings.



### Aspects of Required Course

The group of 14 Pilot teachers will meet on campus on alternate Thursday evenings at 7:15 P.M. throughout the school year. On occasion they may gather earlier to have dinner together. Since attendance is required for approximately 9 evenings a semester, it is not likely that there will be much conflict with mandatory meetings called by the principals of the schools in which they serve. However, by general agreement the meetings may be temporarily or permanently changed to another evening in the week.

The texts chosen for the Child Growth and Development aspect of the course are:

Jenkin, Schacter and Bauer--These are Your Children (expanded edition)  
Hymes--A Child Development Point of View  
--Behavior and Misbehavior

The text selected for the Elementary Principles phase of the course is:

Wiles--Teaching for Better Schools

Since relatively little time will be required in class for this three-unit course each semester, it will assume the nature largely of a directed study program, which will need about five hours of preparation each week to accomplish quality results. However, this should not be the same as five hours of study superimposed upon the preparation of weekly lesson plans and the organization of teaching materials. Much of the course will be closely correlated with the functioning of the classroom, in-service meetings called by the consultants and the principal, and with other on-the-job requirements.

### Lightening of the Load

We are asking the Pilot teachers not to assume outside work responsibilities to supplement their teaching income during this first year because this could easily interfere with maximum success in the classroom and their final credential course in college. As just described, we are also advising discretion temporarily as to the amount of participation in social activities and community services.

By the same token we are recommending that principals spare them from time consuming, all-school responsibilities beyond the routine duties in which all members of the staff take their turns. Similarly, we recommend that the extra large class or the one with a heavy quota of disturbed children, which usually falls to the lot of a teacher at some time, be postponed if possible beyond the first assignment of the Pilot teacher.

### The Principal Coordinates

The building principal will have the same working relationship with the Pilot teacher as he does with the other teachers on his staff. The college representative will look to the principal for coordinating guidance in his supervision of the Pilot teacher, just as the consultants from the superintendent's office do. Thus, the Pilot teacher will not be confused by contradictory advice or by conflicting supervisory requirements.

In the early weeks of the Pilot teacher's assignment, the college representative may be of considerable assistance to the principal in facilitating his acquaintance with the Pilot teacher who has been an advisee of the college representative for over a year.

#### Evaluation

The college representative will ask of the building principal the same assistance in evaluating the teaching success of the Pilot teacher as the supervising teacher gives in rating student teachers. A form very similar to the one used in the student teacher program will be utilized for this evaluation. Its primary purpose is to serve as an instructional guide in helping the Pilot teacher improve his classroom procedures and will not be used as a basis for giving a grade in the college course. It will bear no relationship to the administrative rating which the principal prepares at stated intervals for the superintendent's office.

Roy E. Learned  
Director of Elementary Education

## COLLEGE OF THE PACIFIC

COOPERATIVE EVALUATION OF PILOT TEACHER PROGRESS

Pilot Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ Principal \_\_\_\_\_

1955-1956

School \_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Principal and teacher make separate evaluations late in October, January and May.
2. In column I at each evaluation period check the 3 or 4 items in which the teacher shows the greatest strength.
3. In column II at each evaluation period check the 3 or 4 items in which the teacher shows the greatest need for growth.
4. If mutually desirable the teacher and the principal may discuss their evaluations.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Oct. |    | Jan. |    | May |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----|------|----|-----|----|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | I    | II | I    | II | I   | II |
| 1. Reveals sound judgment in the overall use of time by coming to school each morning refreshed and rested for the day's work; and also by meeting all commitments promptly as scheduled throughout the day.                    |      |    |      |    |     |    |
| 2. Demonstrates a cordial working relationship with the principal, parents, teachers, supervisors, clerk custodians and cafeteria staff.                                                                                        |      |    |      |    |     |    |
| 3. Shows care in grooming, keeping in mind an appeal to children's love of color and design.                                                                                                                                    |      |    |      |    |     |    |
| 4. Helps children provide a room environment which is attractive to them and is rich in learning opportunities.                                                                                                                 |      |    |      |    |     |    |
| 5. Provides for continuity of instruction by regular attendance at school and in emergency absence plans adequate information for the substitute through written guides and pupil orientation.                                  |      |    |      |    |     |    |
| 6. Reduces disciplinary action to a minimum through an intelligent and sympathetic understanding of each child, through systematic planning of all activities and by providing classroom environment which appeals to children. |      |    |      |    |     |    |
| 7. Is an interested attendant at P.T.A., staff and other meetings.                                                                                                                                                              |      |    |      |    |     |    |
| 8. Exercises professional restraint in discussing matters of a confidential nature.                                                                                                                                             |      |    |      |    |     |    |
| 9. Manifests moments of insight into the deeper purposes of teaching which if developed may make him far more than an expert technician in teaching children.                                                                   |      |    |      |    |     |    |
| 10. Expresses loyalty to the school and its administration whenever an appropriate occasion arises. Criticism is presented constructively to those in responsibility.                                                           |      |    |      |    |     |    |

## APPENDIX H

DISTRIBUTIONS OF DERIVED SCORES OF PILOT STUDY STUDENTS  
ON THE GENERAL CULTURE TESTS TAKEN AT THE END OF THE SOPHOMORE YEAR

## Group I

|    | Social Studies | Literature | Science | Fine Arts | Mathematics | Total |    |
|----|----------------|------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-------|----|
| 75 |                | 1          |         | 1         |             |       | 75 |
| 74 |                | 1          |         | 1         |             |       | 74 |
| 73 |                |            |         |           |             |       | 73 |
| 72 |                |            |         |           |             |       | 72 |
| 71 |                |            |         |           |             | 1     | 71 |
| 70 | 1              |            |         |           |             |       | 70 |
| 69 |                |            |         |           |             |       | 69 |
| 68 | 2              |            |         |           |             | 1     | 68 |
| 67 |                | 1          | 1       |           | 1           | 2     | 67 |
| 66 |                | 1          |         | 1         |             |       | 66 |
| 65 |                |            |         |           |             |       | 65 |
| 64 | 1              |            |         |           | 1           | 1     | 64 |
| 63 | 2              |            |         |           |             |       | 63 |
| 62 | 1              | 1          |         |           | 1           |       | 62 |
| 61 |                | 1          |         |           |             |       | 61 |
| 60 | 1              |            | 2       | 1         |             | 1     | 60 |
| 59 |                |            | 2       |           |             |       | 59 |
| 58 |                |            |         |           |             | 1     | 58 |
| 57 | 1              |            |         | 1         |             | 1     | 57 |
| 56 |                |            |         |           |             |       | 56 |
| 55 |                |            | 1       |           | 1           |       | 55 |
| 54 |                |            |         |           |             | 1     | 54 |
| 53 |                | 2          | 1       | 3         | 1           |       | 53 |
| 52 |                |            | 1       |           |             | 1     | 52 |
| 51 |                |            | 1       |           |             |       | 51 |
| 50 |                |            |         |           | 1           | 1     | 50 |
| 49 |                |            |         |           |             |       | 49 |
| 48 |                | 1          | 2       | 1         | 2           |       | 48 |
| 47 | 1              | 1          | 1       | 1         |             |       | 47 |
| 46 | 1              |            | 1       |           |             |       | 46 |
| 45 | 1              | 2          | 1       | 1         | 1           | 1     | 45 |
| 44 |                |            |         |           |             |       | 44 |
| 43 | 1              |            |         |           | 2           |       | 43 |
| 42 |                | 1          |         | 1         | 2           |       | 42 |
| 41 |                |            |         |           | 1           |       | 41 |
| 40 |                |            |         |           |             | 1     | 40 |
| 39 |                |            |         |           |             |       | 39 |
| 38 | 1              |            |         | 1         |             | 1     | 38 |
| 37 |                |            |         |           |             |       | 37 |
| 36 |                | 1          |         | 1         |             |       | 36 |



DISTRIBUTIONS OF DERIVED SCORES OF PILOT STUDY STUDENTS  
ON THE GENERAL CULTURE TESTS TAKEN AT THE END OF THE SOPHOMORE YEAR

| Group II |                |            |         |           |             |       |
|----------|----------------|------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-------|
|          | Social Studies | Literature | Science | Fine Arts | Mathematics | Total |
| 75       | 1              |            |         | 1         | 1           | 1     |
| 74       |                |            |         |           |             |       |
| 73       |                | 1          |         |           |             |       |
| 72       | 1              |            |         |           |             |       |
| 71       |                |            |         |           |             |       |
| 70       |                |            | 1       |           |             |       |
| 69       |                | 2          |         |           |             | 1     |
| 68       | 1              |            |         |           |             |       |
| 67       | 1              |            |         |           |             |       |
| 66       |                |            | 1       |           |             | 1     |
| 65       | 2              |            |         |           |             |       |
| 64       |                |            |         |           |             |       |
| 63       | 1              |            |         |           |             |       |
| 62       |                |            | 1       |           |             | 1     |
| 61       | 2              |            | 1       | 1         |             |       |
| 60       |                |            |         | 1         |             |       |
| 59       | 1              | 1          |         | 1         |             |       |
| 58       |                | 1          |         |           | 1           | 1     |
| 57       |                | 2          | 1       |           |             |       |
| 56       | 1              |            |         |           |             |       |
| 55       |                |            | 1       | 1         |             | 1     |
| 54       | 2              | 2          | 1       | 1         |             | 3     |
| 53       |                |            |         | 2         | 3           | 1     |
| 52       |                | 1          | 1       |           | 2           |       |
| 51       |                |            | 1       |           | 2           |       |
| 50       | 1              | 1          | 1       | 1         | 1           | 3     |
| 49       | 1              |            | 1       |           | 1           |       |
| 48       |                |            | 1       | 2         |             | 1     |
| 47       | 1              | 2          | 3       |           | 1           |       |
| 46       | 1              | 1          |         |           |             | 2     |
| 45       |                |            |         |           | 1           | 1     |
| 44       |                | 3          | 1       | 1         |             |       |
| 43       |                |            |         |           | 2           |       |
| 42       |                |            |         | 1         |             |       |
| 41       |                |            | 1       |           |             |       |
| 40       |                |            |         |           | 1           |       |
| 39       |                |            |         |           | 1           |       |
| 38       |                |            |         |           |             |       |
| 37       |                |            |         |           |             |       |
| 36       |                |            |         | 2         |             |       |
| 35       |                |            | 1       |           |             |       |
| 34       |                |            |         |           |             |       |
| 33       |                |            |         | 1         |             |       |

DISTRIBUTIONS AS DERIVED SCORES OF PILOT STUDY STUDENTS  
ON THE GENERAL CULTURE TESTS TAKEN AT THE END OF THE SOPHOMORE YEAR

Group III

|    |   | Social Studies | Literature | Science | Fine Arts | Mathematics | Total |    |
|----|---|----------------|------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-------|----|
| 75 |   | 1              | 1          | 1       | 1         |             |       | 75 |
| 74 |   |                |            |         |           |             |       | 74 |
| 73 | 1 | 1              |            |         |           |             | 1     | 73 |
| 72 | 1 |                |            |         |           |             |       | 72 |
| 71 |   |                |            |         |           |             |       | 71 |
| 70 | 1 |                |            |         |           |             |       | 70 |
| 69 |   |                |            |         |           | 2           |       | 69 |
| 68 |   |                |            |         |           |             |       | 68 |
| 67 | 1 |                |            | 1       |           |             |       | 67 |
| 66 |   |                |            |         |           |             |       | 66 |
| 65 |   |                |            |         |           | 1           |       | 65 |
| 64 |   |                | 1          |         |           |             |       | 64 |
| 63 |   |                |            |         |           |             |       | 63 |
| 62 |   |                |            | 1       |           |             |       | 62 |
| 61 |   | 1              |            |         |           |             |       | 61 |
| 60 |   | 1              | 1          | 1       |           |             |       | 60 |
| 59 |   |                |            |         |           |             |       | 59 |
| 58 |   |                |            | 1       |           |             |       | 58 |
| 57 | 4 |                |            |         |           | 1           |       | 57 |
| 56 | 2 | 1              | 1          | 1       |           |             |       | 56 |
| 55 |   |                |            |         |           |             |       | 55 |
| 54 |   |                | 1          |         |           |             |       | 54 |
| 53 |   |                |            |         |           | 2           |       | 53 |
| 52 |   | 1              | 3          |         |           |             |       | 52 |
| 51 |   | 1              |            | 2       | 1         | 1           |       | 51 |
| 50 |   | 2              |            | 2       | 3         | 1           |       | 50 |
| 49 |   |                | 1          |         | 1         |             |       | 49 |
| 48 | 2 | 1              | 1          |         | 1         | 1           |       | 48 |
| 47 |   |                | 1          |         |           |             |       | 47 |
| 46 |   |                |            | 1       |           |             |       | 46 |
| 45 | 2 |                |            | 1       | 2         |             |       | 45 |
| 44 |   | 2              |            |         |           | 1           |       | 44 |
| 43 |   |                |            |         | 2         |             |       | 43 |
| 42 |   | 1              | 3          |         |           | 1           |       | 42 |
| 41 |   |                |            |         |           | 1           |       | 41 |
| 40 |   | 2              |            | 2       |           | 1           |       | 40 |
| 39 |   |                |            | 1       |           |             |       | 39 |
| 38 | 2 |                |            | 1       | 1         |             |       | 38 |
| 37 |   |                | 1          |         | 2         | 1           |       | 37 |
| 36 |   |                |            |         | 1         |             |       | 36 |
| 35 |   | 1              | 1          |         | 1         |             |       | 35 |
| 34 |   |                |            |         |           | 1           |       | 34 |

DISTRIBUTIONS IN DERIVED SCORES FOR PILOT STUDY STUDENTS  
ON THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION

Group I

|    | Quantitative | Linguistic | Total |    |
|----|--------------|------------|-------|----|
| 69 |              | 2          |       | 69 |
| 68 |              | 1          | 1     | 68 |
| 67 |              |            |       | 67 |
| 66 |              |            | 1     | 66 |
| 65 |              | 2          | 1     | 65 |
| 64 |              |            |       | 64 |
| 63 | 1            |            | 2     | 63 |
| 62 | 1            |            | 1     | 62 |
| 61 |              |            |       | 61 |
| 60 | 1            |            |       | 60 |
| 59 |              |            |       | 59 |
| 58 | 1            | 1          |       | 58 |
| 57 | 2            |            |       | 57 |
| 56 | 1            |            | 1     | 56 |
| 55 |              |            | 1     | 55 |
| 54 |              |            |       | 54 |
| 53 |              | 1          | 1     | 53 |
| 52 |              | 1          |       | 52 |
| 51 |              |            |       | 51 |
| 50 | 1            | 2          |       | 50 |
| 49 |              | 1          |       | 49 |
| 48 | 1            |            | 1     | 48 |
| 47 | 1            | 2          | 1     | 47 |
| 46 |              | 1          | 1     | 46 |
| 45 |              |            | 1     | 45 |
| 44 |              |            |       | 44 |
| 43 |              |            |       | 43 |
| 42 |              |            |       | 42 |
| 41 |              |            | 1     | 41 |
| 40 |              |            |       | 40 |
| 39 |              |            |       | 39 |
| 38 |              |            |       | 38 |
| 37 |              |            |       | 37 |
| 36 |              |            |       | 36 |
| 35 |              |            |       | 35 |
| 34 |              |            |       | 34 |
| 33 |              |            |       | 33 |
| 32 |              |            |       | 32 |
| 31 |              |            |       | 31 |
| 30 |              |            |       | 30 |
| 29 | 1            |            |       | 29 |
| 28 |              |            |       | 28 |
| 27 |              |            |       | 27 |
| 26 | 1            |            |       | 26 |
| 25 |              |            |       | 25 |
| 24 | 1            |            |       | 24 |

DISTRIBUTIONS IN DERIVED SCORES FOR PILOT STUDENTS  
ON THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION

| Group II |              |            |       |
|----------|--------------|------------|-------|
|          | Quantitative | Linguistic | Total |
| 73       | 2            |            | 1     |
| 72       |              |            |       |
| 71       |              |            |       |
| 70       |              |            |       |
| 69       |              |            |       |
| 68       |              | 1          | 1     |
| 67       |              |            |       |
| 66       |              | 1          |       |
| 65       |              |            | 1     |
| 64       |              | 1          |       |
| 63       |              |            |       |
| 62       |              | 1          |       |
| 61       | 3            |            |       |
| 60       |              |            |       |
| 59       | 1            | 2          | 1     |
| 58       |              | 1          | 1     |
| 57       | 1            | 1          | 1     |
| 56       | 2            |            | 1     |
| 55       | 1            |            | 1     |
| 54       |              | 1          | 1     |
| 53       |              | 2          | 4     |
| 52       | 1            | 1          |       |
| 51       | 2            |            | 1     |
| 50       |              | 1          | 1     |
| 49       |              |            |       |
| 48       | 1            | 2          | 1     |
| 47       |              |            |       |
| 46       |              | 1          |       |
| 45       | 1            |            |       |
| 44       |              |            |       |
| 43       |              |            |       |
| 42       | 1            |            |       |
| 41       |              |            |       |
| 40       |              |            |       |
| 39       |              |            |       |
| 38       |              |            |       |
| 37       |              |            |       |
| 36       |              |            |       |
| 35       |              |            |       |
| 34       |              |            |       |
| 33       |              |            |       |
| 32       |              |            | 1     |
| 31       | 1            |            |       |
| 30       |              | 1          |       |



DISTRIBUTIONS IN DERIVED SCORES FOR PILOT STUDY STUDENTS  
ON THE SCHOOL AND COLLEGE ABILITY TEST

Group III

|    | Quantitative | Linguistic | Total |    |
|----|--------------|------------|-------|----|
| 65 |              | 1          |       | 65 |
| 64 | 1            |            |       | 64 |
| 63 | 1            |            | 2     | 63 |
| 62 | 1            |            |       | 62 |
| 61 |              |            | 1     | 61 |
| 60 | 2            | 2          | 1     | 60 |
| 59 | 1            | 1          |       | 59 |
| 58 |              | 1          | 1     | 58 |
| 57 |              |            | 2     | 57 |
| 56 | 1            |            |       | 56 |
| 55 |              | 1          |       | 55 |
| 54 |              |            | 1     | 54 |
| 53 |              |            |       | 53 |
| 52 | 1            |            | 1     | 52 |
| 51 | 1            |            | 1     | 51 |
| 50 | 2            |            |       | 50 |
| 49 |              | 2          |       | 49 |
| 48 |              |            |       | 48 |
| 47 |              | 1          |       | 47 |
| 46 |              | 1          |       | 46 |
| 45 | 1            |            |       | 45 |
| 44 |              |            |       | 44 |
| 43 |              |            |       | 43 |
| 42 | 1            |            |       | 42 |
| 41 |              |            |       | 41 |
| 40 |              |            |       | 40 |
| 39 |              | 1          | 3     | 39 |
| 38 |              | 1          |       | 38 |
| 37 |              | 1          |       | 37 |
| 36 | 1            | 1          |       | 36 |
| 35 |              |            |       | 35 |
| 34 |              |            |       | 34 |
| 33 |              |            | 1     | 33 |
| 32 | 1            |            |       | 32 |
| 31 |              |            |       | 31 |
| 30 |              | 1          | 1     | 30 |

DISTRIBUTION OF DERIVED SCORES OF PILOT STUDY STUDENTS  
ON THE GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION TESTS TAKEN PRIOR TO GRADUATION

Group I

Social Science    Humanitites    Natural Science

|    |   |   |   |    |
|----|---|---|---|----|
| 72 |   | 1 |   | 72 |
| 71 |   |   |   | 71 |
| 70 |   |   |   | 70 |
| 69 |   |   | 1 | 69 |
| 68 |   |   |   | 68 |
| 67 |   | 1 |   | 67 |
| 66 |   |   |   | 66 |
| 65 |   |   |   | 65 |
| 64 |   | 1 |   | 64 |
| 63 | 1 | 1 |   | 63 |
| 62 | 1 |   | 1 | 62 |
| 61 |   |   | 1 | 61 |
| 60 | 1 |   |   | 60 |
| 59 |   | 1 |   | 59 |
| 58 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 58 |
| 57 |   |   |   | 57 |
| 56 | 1 |   | 1 | 56 |
| 55 | 1 | 2 |   | 55 |
| 54 | 1 |   | 1 | 54 |
| 53 |   |   |   | 53 |
| 52 | 1 |   |   | 52 |
| 51 |   | 1 |   | 51 |
| 50 |   |   | 1 | 50 |
| 49 |   | 2 |   | 49 |
| 48 |   |   |   | 48 |
| 47 | 1 |   |   | 47 |
| 46 |   |   | 2 | 46 |
| 45 | 1 |   | 1 | 45 |
| 44 |   |   | 2 | 44 |
| 43 | 1 |   |   | 43 |
| 42 |   | 2 | 2 | 42 |
| 41 | 1 | 1 |   | 41 |
| 40 |   |   |   | 40 |
| 39 |   |   |   | 39 |
| 38 | 1 |   |   | 38 |

DISTRIBUTION OF DERIVED SCORES OF PILOT STUDY STUDENTS  
ON THE GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION TESTS TAKEN PRIOR TO GRADUATION

Group II

|    | Quantitative | Verbal |    |
|----|--------------|--------|----|
| 70 |              | 1      | 70 |
| 69 |              |        | 69 |
| 68 | 1            |        | 68 |
| 67 |              |        | 67 |
| 66 |              |        | 66 |
| 65 |              | 1      | 65 |
| 64 |              |        | 64 |
| 63 | 1            |        | 63 |
| 62 |              |        | 62 |
| 61 |              | 1      | 61 |
| 60 |              |        | 60 |
| 59 |              | 1      | 59 |
| 58 | 1            |        | 58 |
| 57 |              | 1      | 57 |
| 56 | 1            |        | 56 |
| 55 |              |        | 55 |
| 54 |              | 2      | 54 |
| 53 |              | 1      | 53 |
| 52 | 1            |        | 52 |
| 51 | 2            | 2      | 51 |
| 50 | 1            |        | 50 |
| 49 |              |        | 49 |
| 48 |              |        | 48 |
| 47 | 2            | 1      | 47 |
| 46 |              |        | 46 |
| 45 |              |        | 45 |
| 44 | 3            | 2      | 44 |
| 43 |              |        | 43 |
| 42 | 1            |        | 42 |
| 41 | 1            |        | 41 |
| 40 |              | 2      | 40 |
| 39 |              | 1      | 39 |
| 38 |              |        | 38 |
| 37 | 1            |        | 37 |
| 36 |              | 1      | 36 |
| 35 |              |        | 35 |
| 34 | 1            |        | 34 |

DISTRIBUTION OF DERIVED SCORES OF PILOT STUDY STUDENTS  
OF THE GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION TEST TAKEN PRIOR TO GRADUATION  
Group III

|    | Social Science | Humanities | Natural Science |    |
|----|----------------|------------|-----------------|----|
| 75 |                |            | 1               | 75 |
| 74 |                |            |                 | 74 |
| 73 |                |            |                 | 73 |
| 72 |                |            |                 | 72 |
| 71 |                |            |                 | 71 |
| 70 |                |            |                 | 70 |
| 69 |                |            |                 | 69 |
| 68 |                | 1          |                 | 68 |
| 67 |                | 1          |                 | 67 |
| 66 |                |            |                 | 66 |
| 65 |                |            |                 | 65 |
| 64 |                |            |                 | 64 |
| 63 |                | 1          |                 | 63 |
| 62 |                |            | 1               | 62 |
| 61 |                |            | 1               | 61 |
| 60 |                |            |                 | 60 |
| 59 | 2              | 1          |                 | 59 |
| 58 | 1              | 1          |                 | 58 |
| 57 | 1              |            |                 | 57 |
| 56 |                |            | 1               | 56 |
| 55 |                |            |                 | 55 |
| 54 |                |            |                 | 54 |
| 53 | 1              |            |                 | 53 |
| 52 | 1              |            | 2               | 52 |
| 51 | 1              | 1          |                 | 51 |
| 50 |                |            | 2               | 50 |
| 49 |                |            |                 | 49 |
| 48 |                |            |                 | 48 |
| 47 | 1              | 1          |                 | 47 |
| 46 |                | 1          |                 | 46 |
| 45 | 1              |            | 2               | 45 |
| 44 | 2              | 2          | 1               | 44 |
| 43 |                |            |                 | 43 |
| 42 | 1              | 1          | 1               | 42 |
| 41 |                | 1          |                 | 41 |
| 40 | 1              |            |                 | 40 |
| 39 |                |            |                 | 39 |
| 38 |                | 1          |                 | 38 |
| 37 |                |            |                 | 37 |
| 36 |                |            | 1               | 36 |